UNITAS

Ecclesia "Clamat ad omnes ut revertantur et inserantur."—St. Augustine

INTERNATIONAL QUARTERLY REVIEW

Organ of the Unitas Association — English Language Edition

Vol. XI — SPRING, 1959 — No. 1

CHARLES BOYER, S. J.

At What Point Do We Find the Ecumenical Movement Today? The Different Senses of the Word 'Ecumenical'

EDWARD HANAHOE, S. A.

A Note on the Papal Emphasis in the Chair of Unity Octave

JOSEPH GILL, S. J.

Anglicans and Russians Discuss Theology

COMMENTS AND DOCUMENTS

The Coming General Council and Christian Unity - a Study by Fr. C. Dumont, O. P.

A Letter on Catholic Ecumenism by Bishop François Charrière

The Message of the Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople

An Anglo-Catholic View on the Nature of the Church

ECUMENISM AND REUNION — AROUND THE WORLD

BOOK REVIEWS

PUBLISHED BY THE SOCIETY OF THE ATONEMENT, GRAYMOOR, GARRISON, N. Y.

PH507

Imprimatur:

† Aloysius Traglia
Archiep. Caesarien., Vicesgerens

Rome, April 24, 1959.

ROME - PONTIFICAL GREGORIAN UNIVERSITY PRESS

AT WHAT POINT DO WE FIND THE ECUMENICAL MOVEMENT TODAY?

In the very hall of the Conclave, Pope John XXIII saw fit to proclaim his profound solicitude for the unity of Christians, and on several occasions since then he has made it known again. His twenty years of service in Eastern countries have left him with the painful remembrance of Christian disunity and, simultaneously, with the hope of better times. Coinciding as it does with the full swing of the Ecumenical Movement, his pontificate seems in this respect to be truly providential.

But at what point today do we find the Ecumenical Movement — that endeavor initiated at the beginning of this century for the re-establishment of Christian unity and which has attained such a remarkable scope? Let us in our inquiry try to see things, not as we should like them to be, but as they actually are.

Certain results have, in fact, already been obtained. The problem posed by the division of Christian confessions has been brought before the conscience of an extensive public; fervent study and action groups have been established in numerous countries; conferences have been organized with a certain frequency; an atmosphere of mutual good will has been created between separated communions which has permitted a more accurate reciprocal knowledge and the consequent lessening of deep-rooted prejudice; a good number of persons have progressed in the way of a positive Christianity; and each year from the 18th to the 25th of January, prayers for unity mount towards Heaven from the hearts of non-Catholics as well as of Catholics. Nevertheless, the problem remains, beset by preoccupying difficulties.

The real ecumenical question for Protestants is that of their relations with the Roman Catholic Church. An entente between Protestant confessions in which no one of them demands of the others full doctrinal accord, is relatively easy and has, for all practical purposes, been realized; on the other hand, an adherence of Protestantism to Eastern Orthodoxy is at least as difficult as assenting to the faith of Rome. If one, therefore, wishes to go beyond collaboration and pursue genuine unity, one must aim at unity of faith with Rome. Dr. Oscar Cullmann, the well-known

CONCORDIA SEMINARY LIBRARY
ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI
THE PROPERTY OF

French Lutheran theologian, has seen this point clearly: « I am more and more persuaded », he writes, « that the accomplishments of Geneva must not let us for a moment lose sight of the essential ecumenical problem which is that of the relations between Roman Christianity and non-Roman Christianity » (*Catholiques et Protestants.* Un projet de solidarité chrétienne. Delachaux et Niestlé, 1958, pp. 9-10).

What are the main elements in the problem as we have stated it? The principal Protestant confessions are in possession of important Christian truths. The basis of the World Council of Churches consists of one article alone: « Jesus Christ, God and Saviour », but this article, if well understood, implies the doctrine of the Council of Chalcedon. Now a common confession of the Holy Trinity, the Incarnation, and the Redemption, and the reception of the same Baptism is already a basic accord and a genuine bond. If all men, by the very fact that they are men, are brothers; then this is all the more true for those who know, love, and adore the same Christ.

Nevertheless, this creed is too limited, and in the past did not suffice to avert wars of religion. Other truths have been revealed as well: Christ founded one Church with a hierarchy and sacraments. Besides, the word of God has been better and better understood. Precisely on these latter points, more or less according to the different Protestant confessions, do we find disagreement with the Church of Rome. Every religious individual can understand the seriousness of this situation. What a profound difference in faith there is, for example, between the one who believes that Christ ordained real priests and the other who denies it; between him who admits that there remains nothing but bread and wine after the words of Consecration during the Lord's Supper and him who adores there the Body and Blood of Christ; between the person who sees in marriage but a simple contract and the one who regards it as a sacrament!

The Ecumenical Movement, if it really wishes to be worthy of its name, should bring an end to this disagreement. This is certainly possible, since unity is willed by Christ and since Protestantism, which does not lay claim to infallibility, can change its positions. The Catholic Church, clearly, cannot change in anything that pertains to her essence; nevertheless, when our separated brethren, by the free exercise of their thoughts and their affections, find themselves within the Catholic Church, they will discover that they have not at all entered the house of a stranger but in reality a home which is their very own. The Holy Father stated this expressly not too long ago, and there have been

many who, like Newman, have experienced the truth of this. In different countries like France, Germany, England, Holland, and Switzerland, there exist groups of sincere non-Catholics who are seriously reviewing their beliefs and who are drawing nearer to the faith of Rome. Having no specific doctrine of their own, the World Council of Churches could be the promoter of an intensive work of revision. In effect, it does organize a number of useful studies, above all through the Commission on Faith and Order, even though the importance of the latter has been diminished. But the Council, it seems, is mainly interested in other activities, not all of which are related to the matter of unity. How can one not help thinking that the World Council — apart from some participation of Orthodox Churches — is, ultimately, a Council of Protestant churches and that it uses its facilities to strengthen and propagate Protestantism, even in Catholic countries?

With respect to Greco-Russian Orthodoxy, the dawn of union has yet to break, but we like to think that the night has not yet long to go: the priesthood, devotion to Mary, the loyalty to revealed doctrine are struggling against it. To be sure, political conditions are quite unfavorable; but these, of their very nature, are changeable.

We must not be afraid to confront the difficulties which are retarding Christian unity. The clearer these are seen, the more one feels the necessity of praying to Him who holds in His hands the hearts of men.

THE EDITOR

THE DIFFERENT SENSES OF THE WORD 'ECUMENICAL'

It is truly astonishing to see how one and the same word can receive the most varied meanings according as the objects to which it is applied are modified. How many senses, for example, can the word « ecumenical » take on, and — if one is not on his guard — how easy it is to engender confusion by neglecting the differences to be found in the various usages of this word! This has been quite evident in the comments which followed Pope John XXIII's announcement of a forthcoming ecumenical council. The fact is that at the moment in which the Holy Father was speaking, and was presenting the future council as an invitation to Christian unity, there was already in existence the forceful World Council of Churches, one of the effects of the Ecumenical Movement — itself coming after the unitive activity of Leo XIII. Now, the truth is that we are faced with different kinds of ecumenism, and it will therefore be helpful to distinguish them briefly.

The term « ecumenical » originates from the Greek adjective οἰκουμένη meaning « the inhabited world » (γῆ — earth — is understood), both in Biblical language as well as in the profane. Used unrestrictedly, οἰκουμένη designates the entire world (Matt. 24, 14); but it has also been employed to indicate a determined totality: that of Greece (Democrites, 85, 17), or that of the Roman Empire (Luke, 2, 1). Nevertheless, its primary sense denotes simply the whole earth, taken as the dwelling place of humanity.

Let us now see how this principal connotation of the word is variously determined when with the Pope of Rome we speak of a proximate ecumenical council and when the question regards the World Council of Churches. The French and the Italian, which employ the quite distinct words of *concile* and *conseil* (or *concilio* and *consiglio*) make evident the difference in meaning. The English language, however, in these two instances has only the single word « council » and thus more easily admits of some confusion. Doubtless, this is why the institution at Geneva is called in English « The World Council of Churches » rather than « The Ecumenical Council ».

In the Roman Catholic Church the notion of an ecumenical council is quite well defined: it is the assembly of all the bishops

of the Catholic Church, convoked by the Pope of Rome in order to deal with matters of faith and morals. Its universality of fact is constituted by the presence of Catholics from all over the world; and its universality of right consists in that the Church has been established to bring into her fold all men without exception.

In order that a council may be called ecumenical, it must of necessity represent the whole Church; but this does not mean that all the bishops are expected to be present. It is enough that the principal elements of the Church have some representation, such that the Pope judges to be sufficient. Moreover, persons other than the bishops can be invited to a council — even with an active vote. The unity of the council is guaranteed by the union of all with the Roman Pontiff who convokes the participants, who presides personally or through his delegates, and whose consent is necessary for the validity of the conciliar decrees. The council is accordingly as one as it is universal.

Defined thus, an ecumenical council manifests the following characteristics which distinguish it from every other assembly, even religious.

In the first place, the members of the council are conscious of representing the entire Church; and one must understand by this, in accordance with the known faith of the Catholic Church, that they represent the whole Church of Christ.

Furthermore, all of the members of the council possess the same faith. They may indeed at the start find themselves in disagreement on the questions proposed to them and may vigorously sustain their proper opinions. But their faith in the Church is such that they are resolved *a priori* to accept whatever the council shall decide and as it shall so decide.

Finally, the declarations, resolutions, and definitions of the council are imposed on all the faithful in the measure in which the council has so willed.

The World Council of Churches is thus not a council in the above sense. It is a union of different and autonomous churches which remain such, but which meet together for mutual assistance, to pursue together certain ends, and most particularly to promote Christian unity. Its organs possess no doctrinal authority; they can at the most suggest measures to be taken, but leaving to each member-church full liberty of choice.

Every six years the World Council convokes its general assembly which comprises the delegates from all the member-churches. Such a convocation can be an imposing event, as we have already seen from the assemblies at Amsterdam and at Evanston. The unity of the General Assembly is constituted by the will to

be together and by the common faith in the divinity of Christ. At the conclusion of its sessions, propositions are drawn up for the various member-churches, and a message is set forth expressing the thought and the religious sentiments of the delegates. Nothing is imposed on the churches; it is left up to them to receive or to modify, or even to reject the suggestions of the Assembly.

In what sense, therefore, are the World Council and its assemblies ecumenical? The Council does not at all pretend to represent all Christians, nor does it claim to represent the whole Church of Christ. A great many Christians — more than half — do not belong to the World Council, and they, according to the mind of the same Council, are in no less a manner members of the Church of Christ. It is by desire that the Council is universal. It is above all interconfessional, with a spirit of charity towards all Christians and with a generous inclination to collaborate with all of them. But from this there has resulted a new sense for the word « ecumenical » which indeed retains a desire of universality, but which primarily designates what is interconfessional and that which manifests comprehension, sympathy, and the quest for agreement between the different confessions.

In short, the word « ecumenical » as applied to a catholic council signifies in the main unity and universality, and consequently, authority; while as referring to the World Council of Churches and its activities, it connotes principally a quest for unity amidst interconfessionalism.

If, nevertheless, an ecumenical council and the World Council are radically different, nothing obliges us to believe them opposed. An ecumenical council, by manifesting and confirming the unity of the Roman Catholic Church, will give an example of unity, and by that very fact, as the communiqué announcing the forthcoming council noted, will be an invitation to unity. Moreover, by the clarity and precision that it will bring to bear on doctrine and discipline, the council will render easier for all the intelligence and the comprehension of Catholic matters; and this will constitute an excellent kind of ecumenism in the sense understood by the World Council. The latter could even seize the occasion of the proximate council to explore more deeply the causes of separation and make known the difficulties which at the present time hold back the attainment of the end proclaimed by the World Council, namely, Christian unity.

The statements made up to now by the Orthodox, by Anglicans, and by Protestants with regard to the prospective council are scarcely more than an expression of the present state of division.

If the Ecumenical Movement remains a movement, this state will have to change. In the momentous decision of His Holiness John XXIII to convoke an ecumenical council we see an invitation of the Holy Spirit to bring about this change. It is up to all those of good will to acknowledge this invitation.

CHARLES BOYER, S. J.

A NOTE ON THE PAPAL EMPHASIS IN THE CHAIR OF UNITY OCTAVE

The Chair of Peter is to many non-Catholics a stumbling block standing in the way of eventual religious unity; in point of fact, however, it is the door, the only door, of entrance to the one fold of Christ. (When we say the only door we mean that the attainment of true religious unity will involve communion with the Holy See). This state of mind on the part of non-Catholics is understandable when one takes into account certain national traditions, inherited prejudices, and insufficient knowledge or investigation of the facts. But this attitude is not to be taken as permanent or immutable; it yields to proper information, sincere and prayerful study, and, most especially, to divine grace. Every year throughout the world, many thousands lay aside the erroneous image which they had hitherto received in all sincerity and embrace the true reality. In this age, especially, through Divine Providence, the non-Catholic world is restless and impatient with its present condition and does not hesitate to say that somewhere along the line it has departed from the will of Christ. In this is our hope, for we have the specific remedy for which they are seeking, and in all charity we ask to share it with them.

A most noteworthy instance in our modern age is the case of Father Paul Wattson, S. A., the founder of the Chair of Unity Octave. As an Episcopal clergyman, he had a glimpse of God's design and, enraptured by his discovery, he proclaimed it to others even before he had completed his journey to the one fold himself. « Return to Peter » was his appeal, and this gave birth to the Unity Octave. Throughout his life, this was his all-consuming mission: to gather the separated brethren into the fold of Peter; the Popes, together with the Catholic bishops throughout the world, have repeatedly sanctioned his efforts. The Octave has no meaning at all if not taken in the context of its origin and in the sense approved by authority; the very dates chosen for its observance (January 18-25) are sufficiently indicative of this purpose.

In the formation and propagation of the Octave, Father Paul met with opposition from many sources which were unsympathetic with its aims. But he trusted to the power of the truth and the

grace of God. It is interesting to record that his most hostile opponent, an Episcopal clergyman, became the managing editor of Father Paul's magazine, *The Lamp,* and later a Catholic priest of the Sacramento Diocese (J.A.M. Richey). What had seemed to be a stumbling block became instead a stepping stone through the grace of God.

It is true that opposition still exists in many quarters, and it is to be regretted. But more painful is that stemming from some misguided (at least we believe they are misguided) Catholics who by profession and training should be committed to the same cause. We do not wish to throw any doubt on their loyalty, competence, or personal worth, and we have no inclination for controversy with them. But we shall set forth the reasons for our position, and shall draw our arguments from an unimpeachable authority which we trust they respect as greatly as we do: the Holy See. Note that the discussion is not the fact that reconciliation with the Holy See is the goal of the reunion of Christendom. If they did not hold that, they would not be Catholics; we take for granted that this lies at the back of their minds and motivates their efforts. Again, we are not discussing procedure in preaching, in conversation with a given non-Catholic, or in special circumstances; it is impossible to speak of everything at one and the same time — the order of topics will follow the order of questions posed. We deal with people as they are. But we are talking about the propagation and participation in this period of prayer.

In 1949 the Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office made the following complaint:

> Certain attempts, that are being designated by diverse names in different countries, have hitherto been made by various persons, either individually or in groups, to effect a reconciliation of dissident Christians with the Catholic Church. Such initiatives, however, do not always rest upon correct principles, although inspired by the best of intentions, and even when sprung from sound principles, they do not avoid besetting dangers, *as past experience has shown.* (1).

We have italicized the words: « as past experience has shown », for this is not the first time that the question was considered by the Holy See. We have in mind a prayer movement which was started in England in 1857. This venture was called « Association

---

(1) The Holy Office, *Instruction on the Ecumenical Movement,* (Graymoor, N. Y.: Chair of Unity Apostolate, 1952) pp. 2-3.

for the Promotion of the Unity of Christendom » (A.P.U.C.), participation in which was forbidden to Catholics by the Holy See (2).

One principal reason for this prohibition lay in the effects on the minds of those who took part in the prayers of the Association; in other words, the impression given. This reason was important because of the subtle infiltration of error into the minds of both Catholics and non-Catholics to their spiritual hurt. This feature has not been sufficiently taken into account by some Catholics, and the Holy See has repeatedly warned against it, as we shall see.

It is possible for a person to have perfectly orthodox intentions and to say something that is true as far as it goes, but by reason of imprecision, vagueness, or omission of something necessary, (or even silence) another is led to draw an erroneous conclusion. The wrong conclusion may be concerned about the nature of the Church, its teachings, or one's own personal obligations. The document we have quoted calls this « scandal », and Pope Pius XII termed it « imprudent irenicism ». If hostility is imprudence in excess, this is imprudence by defect — in either case, the end desired is simply not attained.

From the aspect of imprudence by defect, the following statements will make clear the mind of the Holy See. Pope Leo XIII made this observation:

> ... For they contend that it is opportune, in order to work in a more attractive way upon the wills of those not in accord with us, to pass over certain heads of doctrine, as if of lesser moment, or to so soften them that they may not have the same meaning which the Church has invariably held ... Nor is the suppression to be considered altogether free from blame, which designedly omits certain principles of Catholic doctrine and buries them, as it were, in oblivion. ... Far be it, then, for anyone to diminish or for any reason whatever to pass over anything of this divinely given doctrine; who-

---

(2) This Association, composed of members of Catholic, Anglican and Greek Dissident bodies, was condemned in 1864 by the Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office, which prohibited Catholics from membership in the Association. The reasons given by the Holy See for its censure are, briefly: The basic principle or presumption of the Association was the notion that the Catholic Church was 'divided' into three great branches: the Roman, the Greek, and the Anglican; and the objective was the corporate fusion of these branches into one united body, — a supposition implying disunity within the Church founded by Christ on St. Peter, and a denial, implicitly at least, of the divine constitution of the Church. Catholics, by becoming members of the Association, endanger their own faith, or, at least, compromise it, and their membership would give the impression of their adherence to the erroneous basic principle. (For fuller treatment of the subject, cf. *Two Early Documents on Reunion*, by this author, *Unitas*, 1954, No. 1, pp. 38-41).

soever would do so, would rather wish to alienate Catholics from the Church than to bring over to the Church those who dissent from it. Let them return; indeed, nothing is nearer our heart; let all those who are wandering far from the sheepfold of Christ return; but let it not be by any other road than that which Christ has pointed out (3).

St. Pius X in his encyclical on St. Gregory the Great, *Jucundum sane,* notes:

> ... Some even go so far as to keep in the background fundamental principles of the Gospel, lest they should run the risk of losing their following. It is the part of prudence, undoubtedly, to put forward the truth by degrees when we are dealing with Godless men who are wholly out of sympathy with our institutions and estranged from God. ... But to make this an invariable general rule would be to adopt an attitude of merely human prudence; moreover, it could only seem to make little of divine grace. ... He, (St. Gregory) was always faithful to the example of the Apostles who, when they undertook to proclaim Christ throughout the world, made it their watchword *to preach Christ crucified, a scandal to the Jews and a folly to the gentiles.* If ever there was a time when the resources of human prudence might have seemed opportune, it was then; the minds of men were unprepared for the reception of this novel doctrine, so repugnant to human passions, so opposed to the flourishing civilization of Greece and Rome. Nevertheless, the Apostles found no place for this prudence in the discharge of their mission (4).

Pope Pius XII in his encyclical *Humani generis* declared:

> ... some through enthusiasm for an imprudent irenicism seem to consider as an obstacle to the restoration of fraternal union, tenets founded on laws and principles given by Christ and likewise of the institutions founded by Him, or which are the defense and support of the integrity of the faith, and the removal of which would bring about the union of all, but only to their destruction. ... let them not think, indulging in false irenics, that the dissident and erring can happily be brought back to the bosom of the Church if the whole truth found in

---

(3) Leo XIII, *Testem benevolentiae, Great Encyclical Letters of Leo XIII,* (New York, Benziger, 1903), p. 442-443.

(4) St. Pius X, *Jucunda sane,* Pierre Veuillot, ed., *The Catholic Priesthood,* (Westminster, Md., Newman Press, 1958), I, 19-20.

the Church is not sincerely taught to all without corruption or diminution (5).

The Holy Office instruction of 1949 (*passim*):

> ... They will also be on their guard, lest, under some false pretense, for instance by stressing things on which we agree rather than on those on which we disagree, a dangerous indifferentism may be fomented, particularly among those who are less thoroughly grounded in matters theological and not so well trained in their religious practice. ... Furthermore, Bishops will not allow recourse to a perilous mode of speaking which *engenders false notions and raises deceitful hopes that can never be fulfilled.* ... The whole and entire body of Catholic doctrine is therefore to be proposed and explained. Nothing embraced in the Catholic truth concerning the true nature and means of justification, the constitution of the Church, the Roman Pontiff's primacy of jurisdiction and *the only real union effectuated by a return of the dissidents to the one true Church of Christ* must be passed over in silence or cloaked under ambiguous language (6).

The citations given show the concern of the Holy See with the question. Now we turn to the « scandal » phase. Scandal is a sin against charity where it is foreseen that through an act or omission one provides the occasion for spiritual harm to another. The act does not have to be wrong in itself; it suffices that it be *minus recte* or have the appearance of evil. In 1864, the Holy Office described the prayer movement of the A. P. U. C. as inducing scandal. It's reason was the following:

> Hence, no proof is needed that Catholics who join this Society are giving both to Catholics and non-Catholics an occasion of spiritual ruin; more especially because the Society, by *holding out a vain expectation of those three communions, each in its integrity, and keeping each to its own persuasion, coalescing in one, leads the minds of non-Catholics away from conversion to the faith,* and, by the journals it publishes, endeavors to prevent it. The most anxious care is to be exercised that no Catholics may be deluded either by appearance of piety or by unsound opinions, to join or in any way favor the Society in question, or any similar one; that they may not be

(5) Pius XII, *Humani generis,* (New York, Paulist Press, 1950), pp. 8, 21.
(6) Holy Office, *Instruction on the Ecumenical Movement, op. cit.,* pp. 4-5.

carried away, by a delusive yearning for such newfangled Christian unity, into a fall from that perfect unity which by a wonderful gift of Divine grace stands on the firm foundation of Peter (7).

The precise scandal here is the « engendering of false notions and raising deceitful hopes that can never be fulfilled », namely, « the vain expectation which leads the minds of non-Catholics away from conversion to the faith ». For scandal, as we mentioned, it is not necessary that the mistaken notion be explicitly engendered in so many words; it suffices that suggestive material is provided for an erroneous conclusion. If such a conclusion is foreseen as possible or likely and is not forestalled by clear and unequivocal statements, then we have scandal. The spiritual loss involved here is the diversion of the minds of non-Catholics away from conversion to the faith towards a vague sentimental yearning for something that can never happen: a divinely given unity different from that perpetually enjoyed by the one Church of Christ.

On the other hand, the scandal also affects the ordinary Catholic who is not presumed to have a deep knowledge of theology. Unless the principles and intentions are clearly stated, prayers of this sort for « unity » may well issue in indifferentism. When individuals hear it said « let everyone be loyal to his own confession when praying » they may well conclude that their « loyalty » is apparently not divine faith but an adherence to an opinion held as an alternate to several others which have equivalent merit and that eventually some agreement or adjustment will be reached. The danger is a very real one. Pope Leo XIII, writing to the Catholics of the United States (applying equally to other places as well), says: « ... In America, on account of the familiar intercourse and intimacy between Catholics and those who are estranged from the Catholic name, a condition of things exists which certainly exacts from our people great circumspection and more than ordinary firmness » (8).

We have noted some of the norms by which one should be guided in unity work. They are negative norms insofar as they point to things to be avoided. The positive norm for our prayers for the reunion of Christendom is thus stated in the Holy Office letter of 1864 previously cited:

---

(7) Holy Office, *Apostolicae sedi;* cf. Edward F. Hanahoe, S. A., *Two Early Documents on Reunion,* (Graymoor, N. Y., Chair of Unity Octave, 1954), pp. 9-10.

(8) Leo XIII, *Longinque Oceani, Great Encyclical Letters,* op. cit., p. 333.

> Nothing should be dearer to a Catholic than the eradicating of schisms and dissensions among Christians, and to see all Christians ' solicitous to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace ' (Eph. 4). To that end, the Catholic Church offers prayers to Almighty God, and urges the faithful in Christ to pray, that all who left the Holy Roman Church, out of which there is no salvation, may abjure their errors and be brought to the true faith, and the peace of that Church; nay, that all men may, by God's merciful aid, attain to the knowledge of the truth ([9]).

The Chair of Unity Octave as understood and as propagated by Fr. Paul Wattson, S. A. and the community he founded is in accordance with this positive norm.. And it was with this understanding that it was blessed and approved formally by the Holy See. This may be gathered from the opening words of the Apostolic Brief of Pope Benedict XV which gave the Octave its formal sanction:

> In every age it has been the concern of the Roman Pontiffs, Our Predecessors, and likewise it concerns us very much, that Christians who have unfortunately withdrawn from the Catholic Faith, should at length be recalled to it as to a forsaken Mother. For in the Unity of Faith, the foremost characteristic of the truth of the Church shines forth, and it is thus that the Apostle Paul exhorts the Ephesians to preserve the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace, by proclaiming that ' there is one Lord, one faith, one Baptism ' (iv, 5). With grateful sentiments, therefore, we have heard from the Society which is called « of the Atonement », established in New York, that prayers have been proposed ... that this aim of unity might be obtained from the Lord ...([10]).

In his letter on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the Octave, addressed to His Eminence, Cardinal Spellman, Pope Pius XII wrote:

> Almost fifty years have passed since the time that the religious institute in your archdiocese, known as the Society of the Atonement, undertook the praiseworthy plan of beseeching God throughout eight days of public prayer to bring back as soon as possible, as to a forsaken Mother, all those

---

([9]) Hanahoe, *op. cit.*, p. 8.
([10]) Benedict XV, *Romanorum Pontificium, A. A. S.* IX, 2, (1 Feb. 1917), 61.

> who have unhappily departed from the Unity of the Catholic Church. ... while one must strenuously labor so that the light of the Gospel may illumine the minds of all that they may return as soon as possible to the unity of the Church founded upon the indestructible Rock of the Prince of the Apostles (Mt. xvi. 18) so that the divine prayer may be fulfilled: 'And there shall be one fold and one shepherd' (Jn. x. 16), yet it is necessary in the first place to beg this of God by loving and fervent prayer. ... We desire, therefore, that this Octave be spread everywhere in the world as far as possible (11).

As understood by the Holy See, the function of the Octave is not public relations or academic discussion; no, its objective is pastoral, that is, the salvation of souls. In 1864, the Holy See refused to give countenance to a prayer movement which abstracted from the divinely given constitution of the Church and had the effect of perpetuating the state of separation, serving rather to keep people out of the Church than to bring them into it. It should be clear, then, that the objective is to reconcile people with the Church; why make a secret out of it? An integral part of this objective is the presentation of God's design for unity: union with the Chair of Peter.

* * *

Now let us consider a few of the more frequent objections. The first objection may be stated thusly: Is it not presumptious to go before our fellow Christians with a fully laid out plan of what they are supposed to do? Would it not be more humble to let God take care of it and bring us together in a manner pleasing to Himself? It would be presumptious if we did not know the plan of God and, moreover, it is not we who require anything of them, it is God Himself who does so. If Our Lord founded His one Church on Peter and willed it to last until the end of time and commissioned it to make disciples of all nations, it is no presumption to tell our fellow Christians this. Further, it is not humility to pass off our obligation of preaching the truth we have received to those who seek it from us: indeed, we are commanded to do so. « You shall be my witnesses », and what does a witness do but testify to what he has received? By true humility we regard

---

(11) Pius XII, *Quinquaginta proximae, The Lamp,* March, 1958, p. 5.

ourselves as the simple instruments of God in proposing the plan He has revealed and relying on His Grace to complete the work.

The second objection pertains to universality. It goes like this: The Chair of Unity Octave is fully Catholic both in the goal it proposes and the intentions it supplies. It rules out thereby the possibility of non-Catholic participation. Why not generalize it?: Pray for unity without specification. Prayer is directed to God, and He certainly knows what He wills; let His will be done. This is a strong objection and has considerable weight with many people.

The Octave is a form of public prayer authorized by the Church. As such, it must reflect the mind and policy of the Church; and that mind is sufficiently evident from the Papal citations we have given which deal expressly with the Octave. There is a link between the *lex orandi* and the *lex credendi;* the specification of the prayer expresses and reflects the theological principles in the minds of those who pray. If a form of public prayer for unity is proposed which treats the divinely given constitution of the Church as unknown or non-existent and yet to be discovered, then the Church is made to all external appearances to sponsor publicly an error which it repudiates, namely, that it, too, is wanting in unity or lacks some essential perfection intended by God. The promoters of this form of prayer may not intend this at all, but it may have that effect on the minds of those who take part in it; if such an impression is foreseen, it must be prevented. That is why the determination of the nature of the Octave has not been left up to personal whims, but has been given its form and meaning by the authority of the Church.

Now, with reference to the participation by non-Catholics. The Octave is something more than a period of prayer; it is also a vehicle of information, instruction and persuasion. It has a message — a message which answers the quest of their souls. It aims to set before the praying mind the form and feature of God's design. Pope Leo XIII pointed out:

> Our thoughts now turn to those who dissent from us in matters of Christian faith; and who shall deny that, with not a few of them, dissent is a matter rather of inheritance than of will? How solicitous we are of their salvation, with what ardor of soul we wish that they should be at length restored to the embrace of the Church, the common Mother of all. ... Surely we ought not to desert them nor leave them to their fancies; but with mildness and charity draw them to us, using every means of persuasion to examine closely

every part of the Catholic doctrine, and to free themselves from preconceived notions (12).

The Octave is an opportune time wherein to fulfill this admonition — the very time, in fact, when our separated brethren are turned to God to ask a knowledge of His will in their regard. Why defraud them of the good they seek when we have been commissioned to give it to them? We do not help them when we leave them in a mistaken state of mind. « If the trumpet gives forth an uncertain sound, who will prepare for the battle? » (I Cor. xiv. 8).

Many non-Catholics attend the Octave services; we know of Lutherans, Anglicans, Eastern Dissidents and others who are praying with us for their return to the Chair of Peter, and we pray for them that they may find the courage to follow where God leads. They cluster around the priest at the rear of the church after services plying him with questions, making appointments for private interviews, thanking him for the thoughts suggested. Very seldom is great hostility encountered. When non-Catholics come to a Catholic church they expect to hear Catholic doctrine; in God's own time the preaching will bear its fruit.

The Central Office of the Chair of Unity Octave at Graymoor also distributes cards (like bookmarks) on which the Octave prayer is printed without the daily intentions; these may be used by non-Catholics whose conscientious scruples we respect. We encourage everyone to pray for light to know the will of God. The good Cornelius (Acts x) received his answer from an angel that he was to seek out Simon Peter, and we trust that in due time others will receive the same directive. But in general publications we see no reason why the specific aim should not be indicated; it is the message of the Octave. It is the tenor of the mind of the Holy See which authorizes its use.

The final objection to the Chair of Unity Octave has to do with charity. It is not stated in so many words, but it is implied in the practice of extolling the suppression of the specific aim as something charitable and in the contempt expressed for the opposite procedure. The proponents of this view seem to think that it is being hostile and polemic to plead for a return to Peter. What is uncharitable about praying that our separated brethren shed the fetters of separation so that we can embrace them as brethren in one fold? What could be uncharitable in desiring them to share

---

(12) Leo XIII, *Longinqua Oceani, Great Encyilical Letters, op. cit.*, pp. 334-335.

in those supernatural goods and security in the way of salvation which is had through membership in the Mystical Body of Christ which is the Church? What is uncharitable about proclaiming the divinely revealed truth that Peter is the visible instrument of Christ's loving care for His flock? Cardinal Manning wrote a long pastoral letter on the subject of the decision of the Holy Office concerning the A.P.U.C. On the question of charity, he wrote:

> We should have to answer to the Good Shepherd, if so much as one of His sheep were frayed from the fold by harsh voices or rough handling on our part. Charity, in all its forms and instincts, of patience, tenderness, forbearance, hopefulness and gentleness, is our duty as Pastors. But we owe them more than this. They have a right to the whole truth, and we are bound in duty to declare it to them. In this the beloved Disciple is our pattern, the apostle of charity and of dogma the most ardent in love to all men, the most inflexible for the doctrines of faith. ... Clear, open, patient, loving exhortations, definite and precise declarations of truth, without controversy; holding up the light of faith, which by a sacramental power of its own enters into men and illuminates them when they are least aware; confidence in the supernatural grace and the divine mission of the Church, in its authority to teach and its power to save: these are our nets to let down into the sea, our sickles to reap in the Master's field ([13]).

The clear statement of the aim of the Octave is actually a positive contribution to the quest for the divinely-given unity that the non-Catholic world seeks. It attacks no one; it takes one's intelligence, good faith, and sincerity for granted; it seeks to confer a benefit. The fact that a given truth may be initially unpalatable does not deter us from presenting it as opportunity is given, especially when it meets the greatest need. It is no more uncharitable than an Anglican who asserts episcopacy and a Congregationalist who denies it in a general meeting; there would be no point in meeting if each believed he held the final and unequivocal answer. What is resented, of course, is the fact that the Catholic Church declares that it has the final answer; it presents it, not as one of a number of opinions, but as a divinely revealed fact. Hostile emotions in some quarters may hinder an objective examination; non-Catholics may regard it as an implicit insult,

---

([13]) Henry Edward Manning, *England and Christendom*, (London: Longmans, Green; 1867); pp. 154, 219.

an uncharitable act, an arrogant attitude. Actually, it is none of these. If we did not think they were sincerely seeking the truth before God, there would be no point in creating trouble for ourselves in saying it — our attitude compliments their sincerity. If we did not desire their supernatural welfare, there would be no point in seeking their adherence to God's design for which they are searching, but leave it for themselves to find it out. Charity demands that, among other things, we must love God with our whole mind which means that we adhere to and preach every part of His revelation; we must love our separated brethren as ourselves, which means we will their security in the way of salvation and all those supernatural benefits which come from membership in the Mystical Body, the Church.

As for arrogance, it would be arrogant did the matter proceed from some individual interpretations; but if it has been taught from the beginning, and we aim only to transmit what we have received — what is arrogant about that? Standing before the Sanhedrin, St. Peter was charged not to preach a doctrine which they regarded as offensive, and he replied: « We must obey God rather than men ». Gamaliel arose and said: « if this plan or work is of men, it will be overthrown; but if it is of God, you will not be able to overthrow it. Else perhaps you may find yourselves fighting even against God ». (Acts v. 29-42). We doubt that any Christian would regard Peter as arrogant in preaching the doctrine he had received. He was simply fulfilling a divine command. Peter relied on the grace of God to complete his external preaching; so do we. He regarded himself as an instrument of God; so do we. He sowed the seed; God gave the increase. Moreover, our separated brethren have at hand the answer to the test of Gamaliel; for two thousand years the powers of Hell have never prevailed against the Church built on Peter.

Fortified by the example of St. Peter and encouraged by the approval of his successors, we repeat the words of Father Paul Wattson, S. A., the founder of the Chair of Unity Octave:

> There is no other unity possible in the divine economy save that which is built upon the same foundation as the one on which Christ Jesus, the Lord and Master, founded His Church, and you know what that foundation is: '... And I say to thee that thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build my Church, and the gates of Hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven (by which He meant His Church) and whatever thou shalt bind upon earth shall be bound also in heaven, and

whatever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed also in heaven ... '. When, therefore, you unite with us in the observance of the Unity Octave it should be to pray specifically that all those who, down through the centuries, have been separated from the Chair of Peter at Rome, may return to Catholic communion, that is to say, communion with the Apostolic See.

Edward F. Hanahoe, S. A., STD.

ANGLICANS AND RUSSIANS DISCUSS THEOLOGY

(Moscow, July 1956)

Russia is always ' news ', because as a country it is now so vitally important and so unpredictable — unpredictable, that is, in so far as it is forever putting forward new and surprising offers, but only too easily predictable as regards the inherent value of these, since, up to date, they have served only to camouflage an unchanging régime and an unchanging policy. The Church of Russia is not dissimilar. It also to some degree promotes ecclesiastical ' stunts', but they do not militate with the traditional conservatism of doctrine. For some years after the end of the war, it looked as if it were trying to put Moscow in the place of Constantinople as the center of the Oriental ecclesiastical world. It strove to turn the centenary celebrations of 1948 into a pan-Orthodox synod; it pursued a polemic in the Church press — and then it suddenly dropped that plan (1). It has sponsored peace rallies. As long as the ' cold war ' was in progress, till Stalin's death, the Russian Church was acid in its comments on the World Council of Churches and on Protestantism, especially that of America and of the other countries engaged in the Korean war. With the coming of the policy of appeasement, however, the Church also entered into a policy of amicable, indeed expansive, relations with others, possibly only then, because only then was it allowed so to act. Foreign Protestants were invited to Moscow; Russian ecclesiastics began to visit abroad. Among others, at least three groups of Anglicans were in Russia before the end of 1955, and in July of that year, as part of a delegation of the Christian Churches of the Soviet Union that visited England at the invitation of the British Council of Churches, there came the Metropolitan of Minsk and Byelorussia, Pitirim, with the Rector of the Moscow Theological Academy and other prominent Russian theologians. The occasion was taken to arrange a programme for future theological discussions. As a consequence, in the summer of 1956 an Anglican delegation of eight persons, with an American Episco-

(1) Cf. J. Gill, *Relations between Constantinople and Moscow;* in *Unitas,* appearing in a recent special issue of *Vers l'Unité chrétienne.*

palian as an observer, met a corresponding Orthodox Russian delegation in Moscow for conversations lasting from 16 to 23 July. Papers had been prepared and exchanged beforehand, usually one from each side on each of the prearranged subjects. When, in the meetings, the papers had been read or repeated in résumé, there was open discussion. A brief record of both of these processes, abridged from the minutes, was published in 1958 by Canon Herbert Waddams (2), and it is from his brochure that the following account is drawn. The editor has reported two of the Russian papers in full, the rest in large part, and nothing at all of the Anglican papers, doubtless because for English readers the Russian contribution, as being the less familiar, is the more interesting, and since much had to be omitted, he omitted the better known. But to restore the balance somewhat, he allotted a larger proportion of space to the Anglican part of the discussions. The same scheme is necessarily followed in this paper.

On Monday, then, 16 July the Anglican delegation was welcomed by the Metropolitan Nikolai Krutitsky, who introduced the Englishmen to the Russians and himself presided for the most part of the session that followed immediately. Thereafter the Archbishop of York, Dr. A. M. Ramsey, and Bishop Michael of Smolensk presided alternately. On this first day a Russian delegate and the American observer read papers surveying the history of Anglo-Russian relations. Then the Bishop of Oxford, Dr. H. J. Carpenter, spoke on *The Doctrine of the Church,* followed by Professor L. N. Pariisky of the Leningrad Theological Academy, who read a summary of two papers, one on *The Orthodox Idea of the Church,* the other on *The Rôle of the Laity in the Life of the Church.*

Professor Pariisky's papers can be summarized as follows. The Church is not a merely human religious association. It is the Body of Christ, united with Him, and its members with each other, in an organic unity in the Holy Spirit. It is divided into the Church Militant and the Church Triumphant, but these two enjoy an unbroken unity, expressed by the ikons and relics of the Saints in the churches, the reverence and prayers made to them, prayers for the dead, etc. « The Orthodox Church ... warns ... against the demand to recognize a special head for the Church on earth ». The Church is indefectible; it is holy, made holy by its teaching, by

---

(2) *Anglo-Russian Theological Conference, Moscow, July 1956. A Report of a Theological Conference held between Members of a Delegation from the Russian Orthodox Church and a Delegation from the Church of England,* ed. H. M. Waddams, London 1958. (My thanks are due to the Faith Press for permission to make quotations from this work).

prayers and by the sacraments. It is Catholic in the sense that its doctrine always, everywhere and among all peoples, beginning from apostolic times, has retained an unchanging nature and identity, and that the sacrifice of Christ was made for all men just as His message was for all. The Church is also apostolic, in that it was left to the apostles to build on the foundation laid by Christ, and that they did, and « all later definitions, rulings, organizations in the Church had their root in the original apostolic foundation ». The Church is guardian of revelation, which is disseminated and preserved by two means — Scripture and Tradition, the latter the complement of and the interpreter of the sacred writings. The Church, then, can be defined in the words of the Metropolitan Philaret: « The Church is the mystical body of Christ, raised up by its head Jesus Christ, inspired by the Holy Ghost, containing and joining together in one all God's faithful people in Heaven and on earth, uniting believers to itself through the catholic (*Soborny*) apostolic faith, through the Sacraments and the sacerdotal principle (i. e. the hierarchy ordained of God) ».

The Archbishop of York opened the discussion that followed. He drew attention to a big difference in the expositions about the Church that they had just heard. The Russian speaker had made it appear that « the Holy Catholic Apostolic Orthodox Church in the world cannot be divided », whereas the Bishop of Oxford had asserted that it *was* divided, but that the Orthodox and Anglican Churches, though separated, were parts of the one Church. That difference of exposition prompted the question he then put to the meeting: Did the Russian theologians consider that Roman Catholics and Anglicans were members of the Church as defined in the Oecumenical Creeds?

The rest of the discussion was spent in seeking an answer to that fundamental question. Irrelevant issues cropped up that were quickly disposed of, and the Angelican delegates kept the main point before the meeting. The Russian answer was a little hesitant, on such a difficult and involved problem. Fr. Vetelev of the Moscow Theological Acamemy reminded them that there *had* been a division in 1054, and that the conversations in progress were aimed at seeking the full unity that the two parties did not yet possess. Professor Pariisky noted that « three elements entered into the comprehension of the Church — teaching, hierarchy and the sacraments ». It was not clear whether the Anglican Church had these sufficiently, yet he found it hard to think that a body of such Christian excellence was « torn away from the body of Christ », still more that tens of millions « of believers who had not known the teaching of the Russian Orthodox Church could

be separated from salvation ». He « believed that the Orthodox Church had all that was needed for salvation. It was possible that the Anglican Church had made less of its possibilities in some respects, particularly in regard to the Sacraments and the hierarchy ». After some clarifications on the Anglican side about the place of the XXXIX Articles and the 1928 Prayer Book, the Archbishop of York drew the meeting back to the question he had put earlier. Fr. Vitaly Borovoy replied that Our Lord « wanted to see and founded on earth one Church ». During the periods between General Councils, which were extraordinary events, « there was no need to define the Church, since those who did not accept its teaching were clearly cut off from it ». The Orthodox Church had changed nothing, and introduced nothing new. Professor Osipov of the Leningrad Theological Academy affirmed that all Christians confessed Christ, the Trinity, and a whole collection of other essential and valuable truths — the Orthodox were not the only ones to believe in Christ. Some differences between Christians were due to temporary political circumstances (referring probably to the Anglican explanation of the origin of the XXXIX Articles). The basis of the Church, however, was absolute and eternal — « Doctrine, the Ministry and Sacraments ». If, said Canon Waddams, you add to those the Scriptures, you have the Lambeth Quadrilateral.

Tuesday, 17th July, was devoted to a consideration of Scripture and Tradition. Professor Osipov dealt with the first of these topics, and Bishop Sergii of Staraya Russa with the second. Dr. Ramsey spoke at some length at the beginning of the discussion to outline Anglican views on these subjects.

According to Professor Osipov, the Russian Church, though putting the so-called deuterocanonical books of the Old Testament on a lower level and not as inspired by God, accepts the usual canon of Holy Scripture, as do the Anglicans. The canonical books are inspired, which means « that the sacred writers, whatever they wrote, wrote all in accordance with the immediate stimulus and direction of the Holy Spirit, so that not only were they preserved by Him from error, but positively received a revelation of Divine truth, yet without violence to their natural abilities; on the contrary, they became the means of communication of Divine revelation with the full retention and active exercise of all their powers, for example: in the manner of understanding and presenting things, in the plan of their works, in the choice of words and expressions for their thought, and so on ». The Russians, as regards the Old Testament, attribute dogmatic value to the text of the Septuagint,

using the Hebrew text only as an aid, and as regards the New Testament they retain and employ exclusively the *textus receptus*.

Holy Tradition, said Bishop Sergii, « represents the Christian revelation in general, the essence of all belief and the fullness of Church life ». It includes the Holy Scriptures and Oral Tradition, the latter of which, too, is a genuine source of revelation. It contains (1) the ancient creeds, (2) the laws of the holy Apostles, (3) definitions and rules of both local and especially oecumenical councils, (4) ancient Liturgy, originating from the time of the Apostles, such as the Liturgy of St. James, (5) the most ancient acts of martyrdom, (6) the writings of the ancient Fathers and teachers of the Church, (7) ancient histories, e. g. that of Eusebius, (8) the whole sum of the Church practice, reflected in religious books, rites, hymns, Church custom, discipline, etc.

If the question is regarded in another way, there are first traditions, « originating directly from the lips of Christ, secretly taught to His disciples » and not included in the Scriptures; Apostolic traditions, « usually thought to be those Christian teachings and institutions that were established in the Church by the Apostles, directed by the Holy Spirit, and of which there is no literal mention in the Holy Scriptures (1 Cor. vii, 10-12) », e. g. the Apostles' Creed, baptism of infants, veneration of ikons, etc. there are, too, Church traditions, viz. dogmatic definitions of faith, and canonical decrees composed by the Church authority, e. g. the custom of facing east while praying, the ceremonies of the sacraments and rites, etc. « The difference between divine and apostolic tradition is only formal », and so they both have absolute authority. Church tradition would seem to be held on the same level, for the Bishop finished his exposition of his subject with quotations from the Russian catechism according to which (1) Holy Tradition is a divine revelation equal to Scripture, (2) it is the most ancient and fundamental means for the propagation of divine revelation, (3) it is to be judged by its agreement with the Scriptures, and (4) « Holy Tradition serves as an addition to the Holy Scriptures, for it contains the teachings of the Faith, rules of conduct, the rituals of the sacraments and other Church rites concerning its life ». This fourth point seems to correspond to Church tradition.

It fell to the Archbishop of York to outline the Anglican position both about Scripture and Tradition. He put forward a conservative view on inspiration, that divine truth is mediated in the Bible by various literary forms and that the writers retained their human liability to error. Later the Rev. H. A. Williams developed the latter point, asserting as a common opinion that

« with the truth contained in Holy Scripture there are errors, not only of historical fact, but of morals and doctrine ». The Archbishop noted that the Anglican canon was generally that of the Russians and that, while reverencing the Septuagint and the *textus receptus,* Anglican students were free to follow the findings of scholarship as to the best text. With regard to tradition, the Archbishop said that at the time of the Reformation the Church of England concentrated especially on the authority of Holy Scripture, as a protest against the many current traditions that were false and contrary to it. It does not, however, neglect tradition, which it possesses in the Creeds, the Liturgy, the rites of Holy Baptism and Confirmation, and the rites of the Ordinal. The faithful hear the Holy Scriptures in the atmosphere of the Church. « We do not speak much of Holy Tradition », concluded the Archbishop, « in the Church of England; but it is present all the time. It is our guide to understanding Holy Scripture aright ».

After a further exchange of views on some points about the Bible, Dr. Owen Chadwick returned to the subject of tradition. Bishop Sergii had called tradition ' creative '. Dr. Chadwick said that Anglicans were afraid of that kind of thought. They welcomed the tradition that had its roots in the apostolic age, but, he asked, « how do we know that the tradition is apostolic? Is is enough that the Church today should tell me that there have always been seven sacraments? Or must not historical enquiry also play its part? » Fr. Borovoy replied that it was impossible to demand that everything must be found in Scripture, and he read a passage where St. John Damascene quotes the fifth century Juvenal as referring to Our Lady's Assumption as already an ancient tradition. Ought it not then to be believed, he asked. Bishop Sergii repeated that all tradition could not go back to the Apostles, and asked the Anglicans whether their Church accepted Orthodox tradition and considered it equally significant with Holy Scripture.

In the afternoon, the Bishop of Oxford referred again to the Assumption of Our Lady, saying: « It was a tradition that was not recorded before the fiifth century ... It was difficult to take this tradition seriously enough to make it part of the basis of belief about the Virgin Mary ». Fr. Borovoy remined him of the quotation that he had read previously and maintained that it was sufficient evidence on which to accept the tradition of the Assumption. Professor Uspensky of the Leningrad Theological Academy spoke next. « Tradition », he said, « was set forth and carried forward in unwritten form; that is its nature and it is undoubted that it has existed since the first century. St. Basil the Great said that things transmitted verbally had the same value as those trans-

mitted in writing. ... The criterion of Holy Tradition was not to be found in its historical character but in recognition by the Church ». The Archbishop of York then wound up for the Anglicans, distinguishing between the tradition transmitted to us by the Fathers in such cases as the meaning of ' This is my body ', the custom of facing east at the Credo, and the Assumption of Our Lady. The first of these gives a right interpretation of Scripture; the second is helpful to keep a man within the mind of the Church; the third is only opinion. Canon Waddams then summed up in a general formula.

On the next day, 19th July, the Rev. Professor A. A. Vetelev read a paper on *Dogma, Theologoumena and Opinion, and the Formulation of Dogma.* Dogmas are the unchangeable truths of the faith, the voice, the teaching, of God Himself in Holy Scripture and Holy Tradition, binding and necessary: therefore « their significance is absolute ».

Theologoumena are the « theological opinions of the Holy Fathers of the one undivided Church ». If a theologoumenon of some Father coincides with those of others, it becomes traditional patristic teaching, and so of greater importance; but the individual theologoumenon, though to be received with respect and generally used in theological studies, has an authority only of probability.

Opinions, dealing usually with one aspect only of a subject, are the views of lesser individuals, open praise or criticism as the case may be.

« Dogmas, though unchangeable in content, have not always been so in form » i. e. in expression. But on various occasions the Church settled the meaning of certain words, such as *physis, ousia, hypostasis,* and then « demanded that in exactly that sense the words of a dogma should be accepted ' everywhere, by everyone and always ' », so that henceforth, besides the content, « the letter also of a definition of faith became binding and unchangeable ».

When Fr. Vetelev had finished, Dr. Chadwick and Canon Waddams gave the gist only of their papers, Dr. Chadwick to stress that Churches could be joined in a common belief of some dogma, yet be divided over the mode of its expression — as in the case of the *Filioque;* Canon Waddams chiefly to ask « whether the Anglican and the Orthodox Churches do in fact hold the faith of these Oecumenical Councils ». There was a certain amount of statement and answer as to what the Anglican speakers had exactly said, and Fr. Ruzhitsky spoke to regret the variety of opinions in the Church of England, which Canon Waddams in his paper had referred to as an ' enrichment ', remarking that « they had come together in the

conference to get rid of this principle and to draw nearer to one another in a single truth, because truth is unity ».

The Archbishop of York replied. I quote the passage from Canon Waddam's book in full: it is already a synopsis and can hardly be further reduced. It is as follows.

« I should like to say something about the puzzle caused by the sight of so many different opinions within the Church of England. Our Orthodox friends will remember our historical circumstances. In the sixteenth century in the West there was a violent conflict between Roman Catholic errors and the Protestant revolt against them. As a result many theological questions were answered wrongly, but many questions were not even asked rightly. It was the glory of the Church of England that it refused to be caught in the dilemma of Roman Catholicism or mere Protestantism. It became the mission of the Church of England to recover in the West the full primitive Orthodox faith. This has been a gradual process: it is not a process of finding something new, but a process of realizing the meaning of what the Church of England all along possessed. The Church of England has all along possessed Holy Scripture and the Oecumenical Creeds. As to the seven Councils, it is true that there has been a variety of views within the Church of England. We have found the faith sufficiently defined in Holy Scripture and the Oecumenical Creeds. We have also had the faith expressed in the Liturgy. It has never come to us to define our attitude concerning the seven Councils. There have been Anglican theologians who have appealed to the seven Councils. Other Anglican theologians have appealed only to four Councils. This is because the four Councils deal sufficiently with the great question of belief in the Incarnation. The fifth Council deals with technical explanations unfamiliar in the West. The sixth Council deals with the monophysite problems which we have never had trouble us in England. The seventh Council deals with a question which in the West has come to have a totally different aspect. I hope that makes clear our attitude to the Councils. The faith of the Councils is the same faith as the faith of the Scripture and the Creeds. Historical reasons explain the concentration of the Church of England upon some and not upon others. I believe, myself, that there is too much variety of theological opinion within the Church of England; for example, there are some opinions of the sacrament of a Calvanistic kind, and these may disappear. Thus, as the Church of England realizes its own orthodoxy more and more fully, certain opinions within it will disappear. Yet we believe that it would be a great mistake to drive out varieties of opinion. Varieties of opinion are necessary to the intellectual life of the Church, and by that intellectual

life the Church can help the problem of belief in the modern world. It is our hope that by friendship with the Holy Orthodox Church the Church of England will learn to make more clear its orthodoxy in several matters. At the same time, we hope that the Holy Orthodox Church may discover from us that variety of theological opinion is necessary if the Church is to help people in their problems of belief».

The account continues: « Father Ruzhitsky welcomed the statement of the Archbishop of York, especially the possibility of some of the differences in the Church of England disappearing ».

It is not likely that Fr. Ruzhitsky, or any other of the Russians, understood what the Archbishop was saying, and their confusion of mind must have been increased when others from the Anglicans spoke on the subject. The Bishop of Derby referred to some of the more extreme views in Anglicanism and of the value of the « Evangelical tradition too long quiescent ». He ended: « But I believe at present that the different schools of thought in the Church of England have distinctive things to contribute to the understanding of the truth, and a premature elimination of differences might well be impoverishing ». The Rev. Williams saw in the differences of opinion a safeguard against idolatry, and the Rev. F. J. Taylor, an upholder of the ' Evangelical tradition ', insisted that his ' tradition ' was fully within the framework of Church life.

The discussion then returned more to the subject of the meeting, Professor Pariisky saying that this common meeting was a leading to the kingdom of God, that the Orthodox preserved all the truths, without change, of the ancient undivided Church and that all present were united in belief in the Holy Trinity. Fr. Borovoy welcomed much of Canon Waddam's paper, but one thing left him distressed, the statement that « persons occupying official positions in the Church could have ideas which might come to be heretical but continue to hold their official position », a statement incomprehensible to Orthodox. He hoped that that was just a personal view of the Canon's, and ended: « What do other Anglicans think? This confusion in my mind can also constitute an answer to the Bishop of Oxford ».

The subject debated the next day, 20 July, was *Creeds* and *Councils*. The Archpriest Fr. Borovoy, of the Leningrad Theological Academy, spoke first. Creeds are the models of faith and profession in the Church. The Orthodox Church adheres to the standard of the undivided Church — the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed and decision of the seven Oecumenical Councils, to which it has added nothing as of faith. The Oecumenical Councils are the highest authority in the Church. They have the right of explaining dogmas

of faith, of controlling local tradition, of considering and discussing decrees of previous Councils and of confirming or altering them, of being a court of last appeal. The decrees of such Councils are common witness of the combined local Churches; the criterion of their oecumenicity is not their approval by a pope or his legates or by the civil authority, but it is their harmony with the interior voice of the Church manifested by their acceptance by the Church at large, a process which may take a long time.

A paper was next read by Fr. Nechayev, of the Moscow Theological Academy, on the *Filioque* clause. The ' And from the Son ' (Filioque) which the Latins finally introduced into the Nicene Creed was originally a theologoumenon, a private opinion, of St. Augustine, the fruit of his theological speculations. It makes the Father and the Son « a double principle of the being of the Holy Ghost ». Earlier Fathers also produced theologoumena such as the Holy Spirit's Procession *through* the Son, but they remained mere opinions. Even to say that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father only is no more than an opinion and the Orthodox Church avoids that formulation.

« The Orthodox Eastern Church sees in the Latin teaching of the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son a real distortion of the revealed truth of the being of the Holy Trinity and appraises it as a heresy condemned by the whole Oecumenical Orthodox Church ». Heresy, to be heresy, does not need condemnation by a Council. « In consequence, the Russian Orthodox Church most resolutely declared and still declares an absolute condition of union with it the exclusion of the *filioque* from the Creed and the condemnation of the teaching of *filioque* ».

The Bishop of Derby contented himself with giving a résumé of the paper he had prepared on the *Filioque*. He agreed that the *Filioque* was an interpolation irregularly introduced into the Creed, but it was not understood as implying two first principles of being in the Godhead, for there is only one fount of Godhead — God, the eternal Father; rather it was explained as meaning the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and through the Son. Perhaps, he suggested, at oecumenical gatherings wherein both Eastern and Western Christians joined, the Creed could be recited without the *Filioque*, but the Anglican Church might be forgiven if, after 1200 years of tradition, it remained in its own worship.

But the Russian Church was adamant. Fr. Nechayev briefly repeated what he had said before, finally insisting that, as a condition of communion with the Orthodox Church on the part of any non-Orthodox confession, Roman Catholic teaching and the canonical irregularity concerning the *Filioque* must be repudiated.

Professor Osipov was equally unyielding to a plea that the conservatism of Englishmen should be shown as much respect as that of Russians. The Archbishop of York then explained the historical utility of the *Filioque* clause — how in both the distant and recent past it had been a safeguard of the divinity of the Holy Spirit. Fr. Ruzhitsky answered that conservatism should be based on the apostolic Church. In reply to a question from Bishop Michael, Dr. Ramsey explained that in the Church of England little was *taught* about the *Filioque*, stress being put rather on the mission and work of the Holy Spirit in history. Fr. Vetelev spoke again to say « that to use the *Filioque* was to accept two origins of the Godhead: it was to put the Holy Spirit on a lower level than the Son. He quoted St. John 15, 26 and St. John 14, 16 stating that the Holy Spirit proceeded exclusively from the Father both in His creative activity and ontologically ».

The discussion then turned rather to the Councils in general, the Anglicans replying to questions from the Russians, that their Church thought rather in terms of Holy Scripture and the Oecumenical Creed than of seven Councils, some of which dealt with matters in a way very remote from the history of the West.

The next day the Rector of the Moscow Theological Academy read a paper on the sacraments. He asserted that there are seven sacraments, necessary for the Church as a whole, even if not for each member of it. In the apostolic Church, confirmation was always administered immediately after Baptism. In the Eucharist bread and wine are transmuted into the Body and Blood of Christ, who is present whole and entire in every particle, and the sacramental presence there should always be given special worship. « By its essence the sacrifice of the Eucharist is identical with the sacrifice of the Cross » and is a sacrifice of worship, thanksgiving and intercession for the living and the dead, but the mode of the sacrifice is different. « By the sacrifice of the Cross, Jesus Christ accomplished the redemption of the whole human race and satisfied the justice of His Father for the sins of the whole world; by the bloodless sacrifice God is reconciled and applies the fruit of the sacrifice of the Cross to the members of the Church of Christ on earth and in Heaven, for whom the sacrifice is offered and who are capable of receiving the gifts of saving grace ».

Holy Orders is a sacrament which confers divine power for certain special functions. It has three grades of bishops, priests and deacons.

The sacraments are the vehicles by which divine life is infused into man. They engraft him into the fruitful tree. This life is

also guarded, augmented and strengthened by the sacraments, which are, therefore, the indispensible condition for the truly Christian life.

The Anglican viewpoint was briefly set forth by the Rev. H. A. Williams, as his paper had already been circulated. Christ in His Incarnation, both on earth and after His Ascension, showed that elements of the material universe can be the perfect vehicle of God's power and the expression of His glory. The sacraments offer a similar manifestation. The Church of England singles out two sacraments for special honour, Baptism and Holy Communion, whose visible signs were ordained by Christ Himself. The liturgical practice of the Church of England shows that it holds the other five to be sacraments. The Bishop of Derby then drew attention to three points which had surprised him: first, that the Archbishop of York had called the Anglican rite of Confirmation, Chrism, though no chrism is used in it, and that the Russians had called their Chrism, Confirmation; secondly, that the Russians had employed the term ' transubstantiation ', which the Bishop hoped did not imply an acceptance of the Western mediaeval philosophy of substance and accidents; and thirdly, that the Orthodox had referred to *Extreme* Unction, which idea was due to a later Latin development. Professor Osipov set Dr. Rawlinson's misgivings at rest about Extreme Unction, and Canon Waddams tried to do the same with regard to transubstantiation.

Monday, 23 July 1956, was the last day of the conference. The previous day's discussion on the sacraments was continued for some time, when the Rev. F. J. Taylor further explained the Anglican Articles, and the Bishop of Oxford, to justify a greater liberty of thought and expression today, asserted that it was not till the fourth century that the Fathers said that a change takes place at the consecration of the Eucharist, and after that date they used various words to describe it. The English insistence on the special place of the two dominical sacraments caused difficulty to the Russians and, so said the Rev. Taylor and the Archbishop of York, misunderstanding.

The Rev. A. I. Georgievsky, docent in the Moscow Theological Academy, and the Rev. F. J. Taylor then gave the outline of their papers on the rites and customs of the Russian Church, and a discussion followed. The English speaker instanced three things in particular that « give rise to serious theological scruples in the mind of the Anglicans », (1) the use of ikons, (2) the invocation of the saints, (3) the cultus of the Blessed Virgin, which, he said, had been deliberately discarded at the time of the Reformation. Fr. Georgievsky defended himself against the implied charge of

the idolatrous worship of images, and affirmed that « to omit veneration of Our Lady would take away from the special honour due only to her Son ». The Archbishop of York drew attention to the growing appreciation in the Church of England of the Communion of Saints, which Bishop Michael welcomed. And on this happy note the conference came to an end.

One paper, however, had been omitted owing to lack of time — Professor Ivanov's on *Problems Arising out of the Anglican Formulations,* which is, nevertheless, included in the Report. The XXXIX Articles are divided by him into categories according as they are conformable to, patient of, slightly or radically opposed to, Orthodox teaching. Twelve Articles he put in the first category, six into the second, eleven into the third, and two into the fourth, while the last eight, he said, are undogmatic. The two Articles of the fourth category (V, XXII) will have to be changed, so he stated, for there to be relations of intercommunion between the Churches.

* * *

The six days of the conference, as appears from the foregoing summary, were very busy. Nevertheless, a little time was allowed for sightseeing, and the delegates were present at ceremonies and visited churches both in Moscow and outside. They were impressed with the genuineness of the religious spirit there observed, but could not, of course, give any estimate of its diffusion. Certainly, compared with earlier days, the number of churches open for worship, both in Moscow and, so it appeared, in the country round, was small.

The conference itself, so the Archbishop of York said on his return to England, had been a success; both the Anglicans and the Russians thought that. Certainly the mere holding of the conference, in a spirit of friendship and with the will on either side to agree where agreement was possible, was a step forward in the oecumenical relations of the two Churches. But, as the same Archbishop of York remarked: « There was still a long way to go before there could be anything like union between the Churches ».

It is interesting to try to assess how long a way there is to go before union with the Catholic Church would be possible. There are, of course, deep-seated factors of separation like traditional hostility, diversity of custom and the rest, difficult to weigh but of first importance because they give a character of rigidity and acerbity to the fewer specific points of difference. These, to judge

by the Anglo-Russian Conference of 1956, are the *Filioque,* both as doctrine and as an addition to the Creed; and the claim to authority of the Latin Church epitomized in the primacy of the Pope. On all the rest of the doctrines discussed, Roman and Russian teaching is similar — Church and Tradition, Sacraments and Sacrifice, devotion to Our Lady and the saints. There are differences of stress, as for example, about the Holy Scripture and the Oecumenical Councils, but in the main there is a general harmony, even though the Russian theology and Latin theology approach these common points differently. What is said here of the Russian Church is true generally of all the other separated Oriental Churches.

Pope John XXIII has twice brought to the notice of the Oriental world his desire for Church union, and he has announced the future convocation of a General Council, one of whose purposes, undoubtedly, will be to consider Church relations. May it be the occasion when the Russian Church and the other separated Oriental Churches regain ' the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace '.

Joseph Gill, S. J.

COMMENTS AND DOCUMENTS

The Forthcoming Council and Christian Unity (*)

The Octave of Prayer for Unity will have made an exceptional impression this year. Not only because of its observance among greater numbers of the faithful than ever before, but particularly because its closure co-incided with the Supreme Pontiff's announcement of the coming convocation of a Council, one especial object of which will be concern for the restoration of Christian unity.

As always happens, the world's press, avid for sensationalism, seized upon this news and offered a wide variety of interpretation in commenting on it. At the moment of writing, however, official statements, which are the only ones that can be relied on, are extremely laconic. The only passage up to the present which we can trust is the communiqué from the Vatican Press Service released after the Pope's allocution before the Cardinals only, at the ceremony at St. Paul's-without-the-Walls where he had celebrated the feast of that great Apostle. Here is the passage: « As regards the convening of the Ecumenical Council, it is envisaged in the Holy Father's mind not only as a source of edification for the Christian peoples, but it should also serve as an invitation to separated bodies to seek that unity for which so many souls today from all corners of the earth are yearning ». Perhaps our readers would appreciate an informal presentation of the situation as it appears at present.

Will Non-Catholics Participate in the Council?

The fact that the future Council has been announced as « ecumenical » has given rise to some confusion, and hence to some premature conclusions. The word « ecumenical» has been taken to imply an inclusion of all Christian bodies, hence it has been assumed that they will all be invited to take part. There

---

(*) The English translation of an article by Fr. C. J. Dumont, O. P. appearing in a recent special issue of *Vers l'Unité chrétienne.*

was a failure to understand that in the canonical legislation of the Catholic Church an Ecumenical Council is one convened by the Supreme Pontiff, at which are present the diocesan Bishops from all over the Roman Catholic world, that is to say, all the Bishops actually in communion with the Bishop of Rome. It is true that this use of the word is disputed by our separated brethren, including the Orthodox, who maintain that a Council cannot be said to be ecumenical if only the Roman portion of Christendom is assembled. But we cannot go into that question here. In interpreting the statements of the Roman Catholic Church all that matters is the sense which she herself officially applies to the terminology she uses.

The idea that non-Catholic bodies might be invited to take part in the Council was suggested also by the fact that this Council will be concerned with the restoration of Christian unity. It would seem only natural that such an object would entail conversations, discussions and disputations between the Roman Church and the dissident bodies actually within the framework of the Council. The communiqué which we have already mentioned as alluding to an invitation has given rise to the very premature conclusion that these various bodies will actually be asked to take part in this way in the proceedings. But in fact the text of the communiqué, as we have seen, says only one thing: that the Council would be an invitation addressed to all to seek unity. That is a different matter. To speak of an invitation addressed to other bodies with a view to specific participation in the Council in one way or another is, to say the least, going beyond the facts as far as they are known to us.

Diversities of the Dissident Bodies

One must not forget that the problem of unity appears very different in the eyes of the Roman Church with regard to those Christian communions which have preserved essential elements of the Church's structure which Catholic doctrine maintains were instituted by Our Saviour Jesus Christ (in particular, the episcopacy), and on the other hand those communions which have rejected them as not belonging, according to them, to the essence of the Church as willed by God; or again those who, in preserving the outward form, have lost the substance by a break, for instance, in the Apostolic Succession.

In the first category belong the Oriental Churches which are not in communion with the see of Rome, either since the Council

of Chalcedon (451) at which they refused to accept the dogma of the union of two natures in the one divine Person of Our Saviour Jesus Christ, or since the schism of 1054. To these must be added the lesser and more recent schisms such as those that gave birth to the Old Catholics after the Vatican Council. In these Churches, the Roman Church has never disputed (except in certain individual cases) the validity of their power of orders effectively transmitted by the regular imposition of hands, constituting a truly sacramental episcopacy and priesthood on which depends especially the validity of the Eucharist. With such Churches one can correctly speak of « re-union »; this could follow the elimination of certain doctrinal divergencies which differ from us, generally few in number.

In the second category belong those Christian communions which arose from the Protestant Reformation. The absence of an episcopal structure in their case, which some do not even pretend to possess, at least in any sacramental sense which the Catholic Church requires and recognises, as in the previous category — the absence of this, we maintain, has always prevented the Roman Catholic authorities from giving them the title of « Churches » in the strict sense, (except with the meaning of local or particular Churches), unlike those in the previous category. So naturally if the question of unity arises between them and the Roman Catholic Church, it is obvious that it must be on different terms and under different conditions than the others. Such a union would demand as a preliminary — or more precisely as a pre-requisite — beyond the elimination of innumerable and important doctrinal divergencies, the restoration of the episcopal structure in harmony with such a structure already in existence outside them.

The Churches of the Anglican Communion are in a special category of their own, between the other two. On the one hand, they have retained the episcopal structure to which they deliberately and firmly cling. But on the other hand they allow two widely divergent interpretations of that episcopal structure. For some of their members it is by no means of the essence of the Church, which would not cease to be a Church without it. Desire to keep faith with the past, however, has kept them from rejecting it in practice, because it has existed as the state of affairs in the Church from the beginning, and it undoubtedly makes for good government and good order in the Church. The harmony between the two parties is cemented by their common desire to preserve in practice this episcopacy in historic continuity with the past. The problem is accentuated by the fact that this historical continuity is disputed by the Roman Church, which has made various pro-

nouncements on it, particularly through Pope Leo XIII in the Encyclical *Apostolicae Curae* of Sept. 13, 1896. Two reasons in particular were adduced in support of this Roman decision: the adoption by the Anglican Church at the time of the Reformation of a ritual, and the profession of a doctrine, which excluded from the administration of the sacrament the intention of doing by it what the Church means to be done, hence causing a break in continuity which could not subsequently be rectified without recourse to an authentic succession from without, even if later a satisfactory ritual and doctrinal intention came into use. And yet it has happened that rite and intention have been rectified, at least in a great number of cases, for there is a certain amount of evidence that this external recourse has been made, periodically at least, by the participation of Bishops of other communions which Rome recognises as having unquestionable powers of orders, in Anglican consecrations. Hence an extremely confused situation has arisen on which only the most careful inquiry could shed any realiable light. However we do not propose to deal with this question on its own; there are also other theological considerations on the nature of the episcopate and the conditions of its transmission which lie outside the scope of this article. We would only wish to point out in connection with re-union activities that these Churches of the Anglican Communion would have to be the subject of very special considerations.

All this will show the great complexity of the whole question of Christian unity seen from the point of view of the faith of the Roman Catholic Church. It seems, as is indeed possible though not yet publicly announced, that if invitations are to be sent to the various Christian communions for contacts to be made with the Roman Church on the occasion of the Council (we purposely use very general terms) one can expect such invitations to be extremely precise both in their object and in their formulation.

The Council and the Orthodox Churches

In limiting for the time being our examination to the questions posed only by those Churches in the first category, and more especially to those Churches of Orthodox dress, one must remember that there have been in past history two Councils which strictly speaking could have been called Councils of Union. At Lyons (1274) and at Florence (1439) canonical unity, that is, the re-establishment of communion in faith and sacramental life, was ratified between the Roman Catholic Church (then co-extensive

with the Churches of the Latin Rite, and therefore also known as the Latin Church) and the collection of Churches in communion with the Patriarchal See of Constantinople. On both occasions, alas, the union lasted but a short time. And again, the agreement at Florence was not unanimous on the Eastern side. These precedents give one to believe that the next Council could, at least as far as the Orthodox are concerned, be equally called a Council of Union.

We do not know the intentions of the Sovereign Pontiff on this matter. But it seems to us that considering the state of spiritual readiness on both sides in approaching such an outcome, it is not very likely that the proposed Council will be, properly speaking, a Council of Union. Even admitting that one may hope to see such a union as that of Lyons or Florence — and it seems to us less probable, as these two precedents have left unhappy memories with our Eastern Brethren and have aggravated rather than improved our relationships with them — it is to be feared that the results would be of no longer duration.

But it may well happen that without being, or even trying to be, a Council of Union, the next Council might very efficaciously help towards an eventual union which time and experience might carefully and positively make possible. We can only set forth that viewpoint here without dealing with it at length. In such a case, the Council, although not deserving the title of Council of *Union,* might well bear that of Council of *Unity.*

Let us say, for instance, that even without direct contact with our separated brethren the Council might do great things for unity if it succeeded in disentangling the data of a theology of the Church which could well attract the attention of our separated Eastern brethren because it would positively sanction such elements in their own traditions to which they are strongly and quite rightly attached, and which — although wrongly — they feel are incompatible with the predominating characteristics of Catholic ecclesiology which have become prominent especially since the Vatican Council. We might discuss, among other things, the collegiate principle in the structure and government of the Church, a principle which has never been doctrinally denied or effectively repudiated by the Catholic Church, and which seems to us to be perfectly compatible with the Primacy in theory and in fact of the Bishop of Rome. It is well known that the Vatican Council was suddenly cut short, and had no time to deal with the proper powers of the Bishops who are the successors of the Apostles. The fact that the primacy and infallibility of the Sovereign Pontiff only was dealt with has weighed very heavily indeed on the years which followed

the Council up to the present day. It was not the intention of that Council to raise that one single monument; it intended rather to build up a diptych each of whose sides would have defined and balanced the other. Everything — particularly theological writings of recent years on the episcopate and the particular or local Churches — leads us to believe that the second panel of this diptych could be taken up again in the course of the next Council, and this would most certainly be an extremely effective contribution to the restoration of unity, however distant that may still be.

Another contribution of the Council — although a Council would not actually be necessary for it — would be to envisage the setting up within the Catholic Church of institutions endowed with adequate competence and authority to engage permanently in conferences and conversations with other Christian communions after the official closure of the Council. Doubtless such bodies could be set up already, or even during the Council — commissions duly authorised to make contacts with delegations from various communions which may be willing to accept such overtures. One could even envisage the possibility that such bodies might be established before the Council, in order to facilitate its findings of what could be accomplished in that field by the help of such contacts, as an objective which has some chance of being attained by the Council itself. Many of the difficulties met in the past — we are thinking of the invitations sent to the Orthodox Churches on the eve of the Vatican Council — could have been avoided if more desirable ways and means had been evolved for these invitations by preliminary exchanges of views. But in fact all this would not have to be created *ex nihilo*. Especially as regards the Orthodox — but it is equally true for many of the Protestant communions — there are already institutions in the Catholic Church which establish and maintain solid contacts built on mutual esteem and confidence with influential circles in these Churches. These good starting-points should be utilised and developed.

The Council and the World Council of Churches

So far we have spoken only of the actual contacts between the Roman Church and this or that communion. But one must not forget that most of these are grouped with a view to the restoration of Christian unity in a vast and powerful organization whose various activities have many times been the subject of articles and notices in this Bulletin — the World Council of Churches. If up till now no official link has been established between this

body and the Roman Church, it is far from being the case that they have no links among themselves. The Roman Church, more interested in those of the World Council's activities which deal with matters of faith and the nature of the Church, has on many occasions approved of the presence of theologians at world-wide conferences such as those on « Faith and Order » in the capacity of observers, to say nothing of their discreet presence at the assemblies of Amsterdam (1948) and Evanston (1954). Besides, the warm and sympathetic interest with which Catholic theologians have in many countries followed, studied, and fraternally criticised the labours and proceedings of the World Council has resulted in a most cordial response and further overtures. Private contacts have become so numerous that a good number of these Catholic theologians have come to organise a « Catholic Conference for Ecumenical Questions » of an international character, with a view to pooling information, sharing experiences, co-ordinating their work, and offering to the various organizations of the World Council with which they are in touch a basis for contacts more representative than could result from purely individual overtures. The instruction *Ecclesia Catholica* from the Holy Office on the Ecumenical Movement would assume a canonical foundation for such a body which would allow it to develop in strict harmony with each local hierarchy and at the same time with the central authority of the Roman Church. Today this is a well-established group already fortified with fairly long experience, the beginnings also for more extended and organised activities. It scarcely seems possible that a Council dealing with Christian unity could be held which did not take the great effort directed to the same end into consideration — however tragically diverse the doctrinal practices may be — by the World Council of Churches. Of course it is not to be expected that the Catholic Church could possibly seek membership in this World Council as a « member-Church »; she has many times stated the dogmatic and pastoral reasons for her attitude, and we will not go over them again, as we have stated them many times. But once again, in spite of — or more correctly because of — that very clear state of affairs which cannot give rise to any misunderstanding, a more limited liaison is still possible. The part played in the labours of the Council by this group of Catholic theologians could be advantageously extended and to some extent made official. The statutes of the Theological Commission of « Faith and Order », for instance, envisage the possibility of an appeal to the competence of theologians from Churches which are not members of the World Council, to say nothing of the Statutes of « Faith and Order » which actually admit to mem-

bership those who are not in the World Council. On the other hand, many activities of the same World Council (such as work for peace, for the solution of racial problems, the study of social questions, or the situation in countries undergoing a rapid cultural, political or economic transformation) could be co-ordinated with the activities of those Catholic organisations which have the same objects, the same difficulties, and above all, the same Christian principles by which to solve them. In these various fields of activity there is no prohibition in principle which has ever opposed such collaboration. Furthermore Pope Pius XII positively encouraged it, though in very general terms, but his words have not been heard, nor his advice followed. A vast field lies open, and there seems no doubt that the initiative taken in this direction, under the auspices of responsible people sufficiently versed in sound doctrine, could be the efficacious beginnings of a meeting of spirits and hearts which all sincere and disinterested people seeking for unity will encourage.

Problems Distinguished, Not Dissociated

One must wait and see what various reactions will arise in the hearts of the Church-members of the World Council as a result of the initiative taken by the Holy Father, some of which will doubtless not be favourable, and whether it will promote even to a small extent the developments which we consider possible and desirable. The task which will follow for those directing it will not be a light one, but we may have confidence in their wisdom. The decision of John XXIII has already seriously captured the attention of the Executive Committee of the World Council since its recent session in Geneva, and we understand that a commission has already been set up to follow these developments.

Recently a Protestant weekly published, without comment, a letter from one of its well-wishing correspondents which expressed an anxiety which we ought to allay, that the decision to convoke the Council was a clever manoeuvre to detach the Orthodox Church from the World Council in order to reduce it, in spite of itself, to a body purely Protestant in inspiration and composition. Let us pass over the gratuitously injurious implications of this suspicion; we do not consider that such a motive would be particularly clever. In seeking the restoration of Christian unity — on the theory above all that a Council should apply itself to such a goal — if the solicitude for objective truth makes us draw distinctions in these problems (in the same way that we attempted

to do earlier in this article) our interest in the ends which we strive for should prevent us from dissociating ourselves from them. Our readers know what importance we place on the internal historical train of events which provoked the two great crises of unity in the life of the Church — the breach between East and West, and the Protestant Reformation. Whatever factors played their part towards disunity must not be neglected in our labours towards unity. Here indeed is a complex and very serious problem which we have not the space to deal with here. But at least let us recall it in order to make it understood that if we fail to deal with it here, it is for quite other reasons than any superficial or passing whim. Not of course being in a position to pre-judge the attitude of the Holy See in this matter, we have nevertheless every reason for believing that in its proposal to consider the problem of Christian unity in all its vastness, it will take care not to destroy with one hand that which with great pains it has tried to build up with the other.

* * *

We will terminate our reflections at this point at least for the time being. For it goes without saying that if these problems are not new to our readers, the news of the Council impels us with fresh zeal to turn our attention and apply it to them more persistently, in the same spirit of quiet detachment towards which we should always strive. We have the firm intention, by God's help, not to fail in our task.

C. J. Dumont, O. P.

A Letter of Bishop Charrière to the Catholic Clergy of Switzerland

Of the members of the Catholic episcopate who in a particular way have shown their interest in the problems of Christian unity and have closely followed ecumenical endeavors, certainly one of the most prominent has been His Excellency, François Charrière, Bishop of Lausanne, Geneva, and Fribourg. Performing the duties of his office so near at hand to the central quarters of the World Council of Churches at Geneva, he has been in a position to evaluate the efforts for unity at close range, and from time to time has given expression to his ideas on the subject.

The French publication Documentation Catholique *of February 1 has published the text of another letter of Bishop Charrière on Catholic ecumenism, the English translation of which we are presenting in this documentary section of* Unitas. *The original letter was issued in July of last year, but the timeliness of the topic under discussion will justify its publication at this late date.*

The imminence of the feast day of SS. Cyril and Methodius provides us once more with the occasion of making known our mind on the theme of ecumenism, a matter at once so timely and delicate. We have already expressed ourselves on this point at different times during our episcopate (1) and again quite recently in our pastoral letter of January (2).

SS. Cyril and Methodius whom the universal Church, in accordance with the will of the Holy See, commemorates on July 7, took upon themselves extremely serious responsibilities before their consciences, before the Church, and before God. Their courage and their obedience to the Church, closely bound up with the purity of their faith, led them to a realization among the Slavic peoples of the most fruitful and the most decisive apostolate which has ever been recorded among them. The Church herself tells us this in the Office consecrated to them in the Roman Breviary. This is a reason for us to reflect on the necessity of uniting closely the indefectible purity of the faith and the solicitude of its adaptation with courage and even audacity in our rapports with our separated brethren, as well as a filial obedience to responsible authority in all respects. It is by obedience, even when this costs the most, even when it seems that those in authority should advance more boldly, that our ministry and our apostolate really brings forth more fruit. It was because of his filial obedience to his superiors that Father Lebbe, about whom much has been said apropos of the Far East, was supported and encouraged by Cardinal Van Rossum and Popes Benedict XV and Pius XI. Obedience is not only a check, it is also a guarantee of genuine and durable success.

Now, there is occasion to study continually and at close range the doctrines held by our separated brethren, and to take into account the errors that we can commit in this respect. It was not

(1) Letter to Dr. Brillioth, Lutheran Bishop of Vasejo, on February 21, 1946 (*Semaine catholique,* 1946, n. 11, p. 165). Allocution on January 26, 1947 at the Church of St. Jean in Lyons (*Semaine catholique,* 1947, n. 5, pp. 65-72). « Les étapes de la paix religieuse », a conference delivered on January 17, 1949 at Geneva (*Semaine catholique,* 1949, n. 4, pp. 41-52). « L'Eglise et la tolerance religieuse » in *Semaine catholique,* 1957, nos. 13 and 14, pp. 200 and 214.

(2) Cf. *Unitas,* vol. X (1958), p. 31 ff.

without reason that Pope Pius XI, in a letter of June 24, 1924, addressed to the Archbishop of Olmutz, speaks of gross errors (*errores etiam crassiores*) which Catholics sometimes commit with regard to the Churches of the East (3). What has been said by Pius XI apropos of Eastern Christians is also true of certain attitudes towards the dissident communities of the West.

One must indeed take care not to wound the sensibility of our separated brethren by the manner in which we present our own doctrine. This is why we do not disavow but, on the contrary, commend our confreres who look for expressions calculated to manifest clearly, but in an irenic manner as well, the positions of the Church of Rome.

The Christian Message Must be neither Altered nor Attenuated

But if we must avoid wounding our separated brethren and, consequently, causing them to become even more distant from us, neither must our solicitude of smoothing the way to reconciliation cause us to attenuate the message which has been confided to us, in order that we might transmit it without alteration. Here are a few observations I should like to make in this regard.

In the first place, let the terms which we employ never be in contradiction with those used in the liturgy and in the official teaching of the Church. Thus, we cannot permit it being said that the expression « return to Rome » is false. *Ut omnes errantes ad unitatem Ecclesiae revocare ... te rogamus audi nos,* we chant in the Litany of the Saints. Besides, towards the end of the encyclical *Humani Generis* we find it stated: *nec denique putent (catholici) ... ad Ecclesiae sinum dissidentes et errantes feliciter reduci posse, nisi veritas in Ecclesia vigens ... sincere omnibus tradatur* (4). By our imprudent use of language, let us not give the impression to our separated brethren that only that theology which is called « ecumenical » is open to the mystery of the unity of Christians, while the official theology hardens itself into integralism.

Furthermore, we must no longer concentrate our attention

---

(3) « Spes autem firma animo nostro insidet futurum ut sancta hujusmodi Conventus proposita valde conferant ad multa dubia et errores etiam crassiores, obliterandos, qui circa Orientis historiam et religiosam vitam in vulgus irrepserunt ». *Epistola Pii P. XI ad R. P. D. Precan, Archiepiscopum Olomucensium, occasione Congressus Velehrad. A.A.S.,* 1924, p. 327.

(4) Nor should they think ... that those who are in schism or error can easily be brought back into the fold of the Church if the truth received in the Church ... is not sincerely imparted to all.

exclusively on the reactions of our separated brethren and forget those of our fellow Catholics. Now, certain novel formulas run the risk, if they are not carefully explained, of favoring among less fervent Catholics a tendency towards doctrinal indifference. Thus, over the last several years the following intention has often been proposed for our prayers: « That there may be realized that unity of Christians which Christ wills and by the means that He wills ». The originators of this formula wish to emphasize, and with reason, that the *rapprochement* of Christians will be accomplished not only by theological discussions, but still more by what they call « spiritual emulation », that is to say, by the growth in charity on the part of all the members of Christian confessions. God can then bring about the *rapprochement* of minds by the « mysterious » ways of love.

On the other hand, in a joint meeting made up of Christians of differing confessions, it will happen that the Lord is asked to grant us the unity according to His intention, without explicit reference being made in the prayer itself to doctrinal divergences. Psychologically, this attitude imposes itself in determined circumstances. We also know that promoters of that formula admit, without doubt, that the union of Christians will be realized at the moment when all the confessions will recognize the primacy of the Bishop of Rome. Nevertheless, the expression « Qu'arrive l'unité selon les moyens que le Christ voudra » does not at all manifest the requirements of Catholic doctrine. Moreover, this same formula is utilized by many Protestants in a sense which excludes those demands. Here we find ourselves, therefore, in the presence of a typically ambiguous expression, since it is not interpreted in the same manner by those who employ it. One must, in consequence, have recourse to it prudently and not make our fellow Catholics believe that we are totally unaware of the conditions for the re-establishment of unity.

This is why it has seemed important to us not to pass over in silence the dogmatic aspects of the reconciliation of Christians. If they are divided at the present moment, it is because they have not succeeded in reconciling the complementary aspects of Revelation. Thus, the Orthodox bring in opposition to the doctrine of the primacy of the Pope that of the jurisdiction accorded by divine right to the bishops; while Protestants claim to see in Catholic Marian devotion a negation of the text of St. Paul: « ... one Mediator between God and men, himself man, Christ Jesus » (I Tim. 2, 5). But we know quite well that in reality there is no contradiction!

The Catholic Conception of Ecumenism

What, therefore, is the end of ecumenism considered from the Catholic point of view? It is to make our separated brethren understand how the evangelical truths which they profess are found in their integrity in the ensemble of our doctrines. It can be that certain Catholics insist in too unilateral a manner on this aspect of Revelation; that is why we, too, must make progress in truth. When we speak of growing in the truth, let us always recall, however, that, on the one hand the Church as a society assisted by the Holy Spirit could never have betrayed over the course of the centuries, any part of revealed truth. On the other hand, as a living community, she can progress in the uniform explanation of Revelation; and in order to respect the legitimate tradition of our separated brethren, she could always modify her positive legislation on certain points.

This manner of presenting our stand on the union of Christians is at once sufficiently serene not to offend our separated brethren and sufficiently precise not to trouble the Catholic faithful.

May these instructions, my dear confreres, be an inducement to you to pray and to work zealously in the truth and in the charity for the great cause of Unity. May the feast day of SS. Cyril and Methodius, which we shall be celebrating shortly with the universal Church, serve to awaken in our souls and in those of our faithful a growth in the same faith, and an increase of invincible hope, of a never-failing and ever more fruitful charity in accordance with the norms which St. Paul recalls to us with regard to charity in his First Epistle to the Corinthians.

† François Charrière
Bishop of Lausanne, Geneva, and Fribourg

* * *

The Message of the Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople

In his radio address for Christmas, Pope John XXIII had appealed to separated Christian communities, particularly the Orthodox Churches, for a return to unity. A short time later, in a message for the new year directed to the members of his Holy Synod, the Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople, Athenagoras, made reply to the invitation of Pope John saying that he welcomed every sincere appeal, from whatever source, which touched upon

the peace and welfare of mankind. The letter from the Orthodox Patriarch, in the English text published by the Ecumenical Press Service, reads as follows:

Because our Holy Apostolic and Ecumenical See, and we personally, pray without ceasing for the union of the churches, we gladly welcome every sincere appeal for the sake of peace in the Church. And our gladness is naturally the greater when such a church union appeal comes from a Christian centre like ancient Rome.

The sad picture of mankind today, living in the midst of trials caused by the lack of mutual understanding and the failure of peoples to live together in peace, compels the leaders of Christian churches to reconsider their duty. We have a common duty as religious leaders to make it known to the world that technological and scientific achievements are not sufficient in themselves for building a new world civilisation, for the very reason that no world civilisation is possible unless it is established on spiritual, religious, and moral foundations. Christ is the only One who makes love, peace, and justice possible among men.

Therefore, in deepest consciousness of this duty, we declare the sincere willingness of our Orthodox Church to continue in prayer and supplication for the peace of the whole world and to cooperate positively in practical ways for the advancement of the cause of church unity.

We are happy and most eager to cooperate with all. We already participate in, and fully collaborate with, the great interchurch organisations, and we are ready to enter into special contact with the ancient Roman Church to the end of alleviating the « distress of nations with perplexity ... for fear and for looking after these things which are coming on the earth » (Luke 21: 25-26) and of realising man's hope for a happier perspective in regard to the future.

We consider it therefore more than opportune in the cataclysmic situation in which mankind lives today, that we, who are called by God to the task of looking after « that which cometh upon us daily and the care of all the churches » (II Cor: 11, 28), should meet and think together upon the most profound and imperative needs of the millions of faithful of our churches, so that they may be helped to find the solution or the alleviation of the problems that surround them.

While during the present holidays our mind was fully dominated by such thoughts and questions, the news reached us, in an indirect way, of the renewed appeal of His Holiness, the Primate

CAREY S. THOMAS LIBRARY
DENVER CONSERVATIVE BAPTIST SEMINARY
P. O. BOX 10,000
DENVER, COLORADO 80210

of the Roman Church, for the union of the churches. We greet this *appeal* in a brotherly spirit, for we interpret the *appeal* as a clear understanding that the spiritual forces, which are seen in their fulness and power in the ideal and most desirable state of unity which our Lord bequeathed to His Church, must truly meet again and become united. Such a uniting of spiritual forces is of course not possible in the present state of division and discord, which has existed for centuries.

We further interpret this appeal, which was contained in His Holiness' Christmas message, as an indication that the meaning of Christmas is to be found not in some vague conception of self-perfection or Christian virtue in general, but in the power which makes it possible for mortal man to rediscover his lost likeness to his all-perfect Creator; the message of Christmas shows us the way to that reconciliation among ourselves and with God which is demanded of all of us.

We feel therefore more than convinced that every appeal for unity must be accompanied by such concrete deeds and actions as are necessary to prove our intentions in full harmony with our works and which would bring the members of our churches indeed closer to God, at least on the ground of practical Christianity for the present, and always in spirit of equality, justice, spiritual freedom and mutual respect.

In the course of the present holidays which are centred around the Epiphany of our Saviour and Lord Jesus Christ, Who manifested Himself in the East, we find it proper to hope and pray that, in this season when the thoughts of all Christians are turned toward the East, whence « the Prince of peace and the Everlasting Father » (Isaias, 9: 6) came, the Holy Church of Rome may also in a brotherly spirit turn toward the East. This we wish and expect from His Holiness, the new Pope of Rome, John 23rd, who is so well known, loved, and respected in our church jurisdictions; and this wish is not ours alone, but it is the expectation of all Christians who hope to see the dawn of a real new year in Christ.

* * *

An Anglo-Catholic View of the Nature of the Church

Writing in The Dome *for March, an Anglo-Catholic monthly in England which is now in the second year of publication, Dr. Hamilton Hess discusses the nature of the Church as it is viewed by ecumenically-minded Anglicans and Protestants and how their*

CAREY S. THOMAS LIBRARY
DENVER CONSERVATIVE BAPTIST SEMINARY
3401 S. UNIVERSITY BLVD.
ENGLEWOOD, COLORADO

conception stands in contrast to the Catholic position. Dr. Hess, who is an American Episcopal clergyman, sees this divergence on this all-important principle as leading further away from the attainment of Christian unity and argues for a more forthright consideration of the Catholic notion of the Church. The major part of his article for The Dome *follows*:

The Doctrine Of The Church And Christian Unity

Few would deny that the doctrine of the nature of the Church is a fundamental issue in the quest for Christian unity. One of the most encouraging fruits of the ecumenical discussions which have taken place between Anglicans and others during the past forty years is the manifest growth of appreciation among Christians of various traditions for the Church as a corporate visible union of the faithful in Christ.

While we have reason to be thankful for this advance in common understanding, we have cause for grave alarm over the doctrine of the Church's nature which has dominated ecumenical thinking. This doctrine embodies the proposition that all Christian bodies are in varying degrees within the visible structure of the Church, and that all in some degree are true but defective expressions of her life. All are seen to be sharers in a real sense in the covenanted, sacramental operation of the Holy Spirit. The way to reunion is envisaged as a mutual exhange of elements of the heritage of the true Church which each possesses in part. The 'coming great Church' is thus viewed as possessing in fulness those elements which the separated bodies now possess in diversity. This doctrine has, of course, provided a facile solution to problems arising from the concepts of validity and invalidity as applied to the sacramental life of particular Christian bodies and has facilitated a *rapprochement* hitherto impossible between the Anglican Communion and world Protestantism.

For this reason, that which has become the « ecumenical » doctrine of the Church has had a great and compelling appeal. It is, however, a cause of growing tragedy for us all that this doctrine rests upon a fundamental denial of the Catholic doctrine of the Church and that in the opinion of many the schemes of union being built upon it fail to express the organic structure of the Catholic Church or to convey her continuing Sacramental life.

Lambeth Appeal

As a factor of practical influence the « ecumenical » doctrine of the Church was first propounded to Christendom in the Lambeth Appeal « To All Christian People » at the Conference of 1920. In a perspective of the past four decades the *Appeal* has had a determining influence both upon the Ecumenical Movement in general and upon the Anglican relation to it in particular. In the following quotations I shall allow the *Appeal* to state its own doctrine: « We acknowledge all those who believe in Our Lord Jesus Christ and have been baptised into the name of the Holy Trinity, as sharing with us membership in the universal Church of Christ which is His Body ... We believe that God wills fellowship. By God's own act this fellowship was made, in and through Jesus Christ, and its life is in His Spirit. We believe that it is God's purpose to manifest this fellowship, so far as this world is concerned, in an outward, visible, and united society, holding one faith, having its own recognized officers, using God-given means of grace, and inspiring all its members to the world-wide service of the Kingdom of God. *This is what we mean by the Catholic Church* ». But, the statement continues, « *This united fellowship is not visible in the world today. On the one hand* there are other ancient episcopal Communions in East and West to whom ours is bound by many ties of common faith and tradition. *On the other hand* there are the great non-episcopal Communions standing for rich elements of truth, liberty, and life which might otherwise have been obscured and neglected ... in fact, we are all organized in different groups, each one keeping to itself gifts that rightly belong to the whole fellowship and tending to live its own life apart from the rest ... The time has come, we believe, for all the separated groups of Christians to agree in forgetting the things that are behind and reaching out towards the goal of a reunited Catholic Church ... The vision which rises before us is that of a Church genuinely Catholic, loyal to all Truth, and gathering into its fellowship all who profess and call themselves Christians, within whose visible unity all the treasures of faith and order, bequeathed as a heritage by the past to the present, shall be possessed in common and made serviceable to the whole Body of Christ ». (H. Bettenson, *Documents of the Christian Church*, 1947, pp. 442-44; italics mine).

In this statement the Church of God is envisaged as being composed in the present day of divers bodies of Christians, episcopal and non-episcopal alike, who believe in Jesus Christ, and

who have been baptised into the name of the Trinity. The *Catholic* Church is not visibly existent in the world today, but finds her essential being latently expressed in the divers strands of tradition and fellowship. She will be manifest only when the separated bodies which retain the various aspects of her heritage are united in one visible fellowship. The means of reunion are implicit in this doctrine of the nature of the Church, and the *Appeal* goes on to outline the process as an acceptance of the points of the Lambeth Quadrilateral, now revised. It is worthwhile noting that the original Quadrilateral was published as an outline of the areas in which discussions preparatory to reunion might best be carried out, the entire substratum of Catholic Faith and Order being pre-supposed, but that it is now advanced as a statement of the general terms of union without reference to theological setting. This is a significant change to be sure, and has had the deplorable effect of voiding the terms of doctrinal content. The specific Anglican contribution to a union thus achieved is stated in the *Appeal* to be the « Episcopate »; but not, indeed, the episcopate as the essential ministry, for it is stated that « It is not that we call in question for a moment the spiritual reality of the ministries of those Communions who do not possess the Episcopate », but that « on the contrary, we thankfully acknowledge that these ministries have been manifestly blessed and owned by the Holy Spirit as effective means of grace ». The episcopate is commended not on grounds of divine institution but on considerations of « history and present experience » as the one means of providing « a ministry acknowledged by every part of the Church as possessing not only the inward call of the Spirit but also the Communion of Christ and the authority of the whole body ». The means for incorporating the « Episcopal » facet of the Catholic heritage into the united stream of traditions is characteristically conceived in terms of a mutual exchange of ministerial commissions, episcopal and non-episcopal alike.

Organizational Continuity

In common with the «ecumenical » doctrine of the Church, the Catholic doctrine, indeed, accounts all who have been baptised into the name of the Trinity as sharing membership in the Church. So, too, the Catholic doctrine allows that much of the Catholic heritage of Faith and Order has been retained by many of the Protestant bodies and that it is frequently manifested in forms which Catholic usage would do well to emulate. The Catholic

doctrine also allows that the corporate life of these bodies has been furthered by the workings of the Holy Spirit. Here, however, the common ground between the two doctrines ends. In the Catholic doctrine the Catholic Church is in this world a visible organism having corporate, organisational continuity with her own past and is recognizable by notes or characteristics which express her true nature. While all validly baptised souls are included within her membership, only those who are visibly united to her communion are sharers in her corporate life. Societies of Christians outside the structure of the visible Church are not « Churches » and do not express within themselves the life of the Church Catholic. It is widely agreed by exponents of the Catholic doctrine that the operative grace of God is not bound to His own divine Institution and that the manifest work of the Holy Spirit extends outside her limits, although such grace, with the exception of baptismal grace, is unconvenanted or non-sacramental. While by no means denying a reality to the life in Christ of Christians outside the existing unity of the Church, the Catholic doctrine does demand for the reunion of those separated from her a return to that essential Unity already given and preserved in corporate continuity and characterised by a recognisable union of Catholic Faith and Order. It demands incorporation into the existing unity for participation in the visible, covenanted life of the Church Catholic.

Essential Variance

Thus, the « ecumenical » doctrine of the Church and its means for the achievement of unity finds itself in essential variance from the Catholic Doctrine. However, that which was propounded at Lambeth in 1920 has been reiterated at Lambeth in 1930, and 1948, and in 1958. The novel doctrine has been maintained, and its application has been increasingly furthered through projected syntheses of traditions and mutual commissionings of episcopal and non-episcopal ministries. While the bold statement of 1920 has been noticeably tempered in more recent statements and while certain « safeguards » to quiet the Catholic conscience have been inserted in particular union schemes, the same basic pre-suppositions and principles remain. They have borne fruit in South India, hold promise of full expression in North India and Ceylon, and underlie the current discussions between Anglicans and Protestants in Britain, America, and elsewhere. Anglican cooperation in, and approval of, these schemes has frequently been accompanied by some degree of mental reservation regarding the doctrine upon

which they are founded, but such evasive action is surely indefensible. Again, to keep peace within the Anglican household and to avoid the essential irreconcilability between the « ecumenical » doctrine of the Church and the Catholic doctrine, attempts have been made toward their synthesis; but in the opinion of many these attempts have failed. As in all things, an over-simplification of issues in the present area of discussion is a constant danger; a danger to the present writer as to those who have attempted to reconcile the fundamentally different doctrines of the Church which we are here holding in view. ...

Hamilton Hess

ECUMENISM AND REUNION

Pope John XXIII Announces Intention to Convene Ecumenical Council

His Holiness, Pope John XXIII, has revealed his decision to convoke a general council within a year or two, the first to be held since the Vatican Council of 1870. The Pope made the unexpected announcement at a consistory of eighteen cardinals, following the ceremonies held in the Basilica of St. Paul in Rome at which His Holiness presided on January 25, the concluding day of the Octave of Prayer for Christian Unity. Although he did not mention the specific topics with which the council would concern itself, Pope John, however, indicated that Christian unity is a foremost aim in his decision to summon the council. No date for the latter has yet been made known, but it is believed that at least a year is necessary before arrangements can be completed in drawing up the agenda of the council's work and for preparing the accommodations for the influx of participants and observers.

Shortly after the consistory of January 25, the Vatican Press Office released the following communiqué in which the news of the prospective council was made known to the world:

> On the occasion of the visit made this morning to the patriarchal Basilica of St. Paul Outside-the-Walls, and after having attended a prayer service in the papal chapel, His Holiness John XXIII delivered an allocution to the cardinals who participated in the ceremony.
>
> His Holiness spoke on several points concerning the most important apostolic activities which have been suggested to him by the first three months of his Pontificate and which concern his responsibilities as Bishop of Rome and Supreme Shepherd of the Church Universal.
>
> As Bishop of Rome, the Holy Father stressed the considerable growth of the city over these last decades and the serious problems posed by the spiritual assistance of the population.

As Supreme Pastor of the Church, he alluded to the dangers which especially threaten the spiritual life of the faithful in our day, that is to say, those errors which insinuate themselves here and there, and the excessive attraction of material things, spread abroad today more than ever by technical progress.

In order to confront these pressing difficulties of the Christian people, the Sovereign Pontiff, drawing inspiration from the age-old practices of the Church, has announced three events of the greatest importance, namely: a diocesan synod for Rome; the celebration of an Ecumenical Council for the universal Church; and the bringing up to date of the Code of Canon Law, preceded by the proximate promulgation of the Code of Canon Law for the Eastern Church.

Apropos of the ecumenical council, it will not only have for its end the spiritual good of the Christian people, but in the mind of the Holy Father it will serve also as an invitation to the separated communities towards the quest of that Unity to which so many today aspire in all parts of the world.

Addressing the pastors of Rome towards the end of January, Pope John declared that the Church today wants only the reign of God and the welfare and unity of souls. He acknowledged that bringing about harmony between the Catholic Church and separated Christians would certainly seem to be difficult, but emphasized that the separation has already lasted too long. He warned against giving too much attention to the historic disputes of the past, or to where the blame for the ruptures should be placed. Noting that in the period since the different separations the Church of Rome has grown stronger, His Holiness declared that « this is a sign of God's unfailing presence in the Church and an indication that the Catholic Church possesses the truth ». Since his elevation to the Papacy in October, Pope John has repeatedly invited separated Christians to return to unity. He recently told a group of Armenian Rite Catholics in an audience that there is reason to hope that Christian unity « can be achieved, and be achieved with perfection ».

The forthcoming council will be the twenty-first general council in the history of the Church. The first was the Council of Nicaea, convened in the year 325, which issued the Nicene Creed and defined the true divinity of Christ. The longest ecumenical council was that of Trent which lasted for eighteen years (1545 to 1563) spanning the pontificates of five popes. This council met the challenge of the Reformers against the authority of the Church and sought

to restore ecclesiastical discipline. The last ecumenical council met at the Vatican on December 8, 1869 and lasted until July 18, 1870. The Vatican Council is best known for its definition of the infallibility of the Pope, which states that when he speaks on faith and morals *ex cathedra* as shepherd and teacher of all Christians he is divinely preserved from error and the doctrine proclaimed must, accordingly, be held by the entire Church.

Among the Catholic commentators on the forthcoming council was His Eminence, Cardinal Montini, Archbishop of Milan, former substitute secretary of State and a trained observer of Church affairs. In a recent statement he declared: « This council will be the greatest which the Church has ever celebrated in its twenty centuries of history, a great confluence both numerically and spiritually, representing the total and pacific unity of the hierarchy of the Church. It will be the greatest for the universality of its dimensions and for its genuine interest to the entire world ».

Another Catholic comment of interest relating to the council was that of the editor of the *Osservatore Romano,* Count Dalla Torre, whose editorial early in February declared that the unity to which the council is a summons is a religious duty towards Christ who has been awaiting it ever since the centuries-old break in the East.

« The faults », wrote Count Dalla Torre, « of which unfortunately even Catholics are not altogether free, lie in our not having prayed enough to God to make smooth the ways of convergence within His Church; in not having felt this charity to the fullest; in not having exercised it towards our separated brethren, choosing instead the rigour of learned dispute rather than that unfailing love that has its own far more persuasive powers; in having chosen philosophical austerity rather than the lovable and friendly serenity of the *Controversie* of St. Francis de Sales ».

The coming assembly, concluded the editor of the *Osservatore Romano,* will be a Council of Unity, a Council of Pardon, and a Council of Civilizations; and all three aspects will be centered about Pope John XXIII « in all his teachings, in his great-heartedness, in the open-armed welcoming embrace that he has stretched forth to all ... It will be a Council of Evangelical Charity, through which the Roman Synod and the publication of the revised Code of Canon Law will take on substance and meaning, as sharing in the purpose of the Ecumenical Assembly. Charity needs examples; it needs disciplined action of a high standard of virtue and order. The Roman Church must set this example; it is a privilege and a duty which she cannot renounce ».

* * *

Orthodox and Protestant Leaders Express Mingled Reactions to Future Council

Non-Catholic reaction to the announcement of the proposed council has been for the most part one of hope and enthusiasm, as being a possible means of achieving Christian unity. In New York, Metropolitan Anthony Bashir, who comes under the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate of Antioch, affirmed: « I do not find any reason why the apostolic churches should be divided. There is only one holy apostolic Church. Its differences could be ironed out in ecumenical councils ». The Metropolitan maintained that « the only basis for unity is to go back to the understanding that existed before the great schism in 1054 » and said that the doctrine of papal infallibility in matters of faith and morals promulgated by the Vatican Council in 1870 was one of the stumbling blocks to unity.

In London, another Orthodox leader, Bishop James Virvos, who comes under the Patriarchate of Constantinople, expressed his satisfaction at the Pope's decision. « In all our services we pray daily for the union and stability of the Churches. I am bound to say that this is a great move on the part of the Pope, and that I hope it is inspired by the spirit of the Christian Church as it was experienced in the first ten centuries when the Church was one and undivided ».

Among the well known Protestant leaders who expressed their views on the proposed council was Pastor Marc Boegner of the Reformed Church of France and a former president of the World Council of Churches. In a newspaper interview, Pastor Boegner felt that it was still too soon to declare anything other than his own personal opinion. He then said: « The initiative which John XXIII has just taken can be of capital importance if all the great confessions separated from the Roman Church are invited to participate in the Council which he has just decided to convene. Should the contrary be the case, it could unfortunately come about that instead of leading to a *rapprochement,* the Council may well provoke a rigidity of position ».

Dr. Boegner called attention to the existence of walls of separation which are « humanly unbreakable », but at the same time emphasized that a radically new atmosphere has developed in recent years. A striking instance of this, he said, was the extraordinary participation by Catholic and Protestant alike in the activities connected with the January Octave of Prayer.

At a meeting of its Executive Committee in Geneva, February 9-13, the World Council of Churches withheld formal comment on the Pope's announcement. Although the lack of specific information about the future council made it impossible, in the judgment of the Committee, to make any official statement, the proposal met with widespread interest by the Orthodox, Anglican, Old Catholic, and Protestant churches having membership in the Council.

In a statement for the press, Dr. W. A. Visser 't Hooft, general secretary of the W. C. C., termed the decision of Pope John to convene a general council as having « special significance for the World Council of Churches because it is accompanied by the statement that this council ' will have as one of its objectives the invitation to the separated communities to seek the unity which so many souls in all parts of the world desire ardently '.

« The World Council of Churches », continued Dr. Visser 't Hooft, « exists to help the churches to manifest the essential unity of the Church of Christ and takes therefore a deep interest in all initiatives taken to further unity whether they come from one of its member churches or from a church outside its membership ».

The General Secretary said that the policy of the W. C. C. towards the ecumenical council will depend on the manner in which the latter will be constituted and on how it will proceed. « In other words », he said, « the question is: how ecumenical will the council be in composition and in spirit? We can only express the hope that the Roman Catholic Church will draw the necessary consequences from the development of the ecumenical movement over the last forty years. All Christians, whatever their confession, hope and pray that this historic event may be used for the advancement of the cause of that Christian unity for which our Lord prayed ».

Meanwhile, the International Council of Christian Churches issued a statement welcoming the Pope's proposal because « it would separate apostate Protestants from true Protestants ». « True Protestants », read the statement, « will not cooperate in the proposed ecumenical council ».

* * *

Holy Father Commends Observance of Unity Octave

On several distinct occasions in January, Pope John XXIII made reference to the Unity Octave of prayer and commended it to the faithful. The first instance was in a letter to the Cardinal Vicar of Rome in which the Pope told of his intention to go to

the Basilica of St. Paul on the last day of the Octave for a service of prayer for the Catholics of China. In this letter, the Holy Father calls the Octave a « precious and providential observance ».

The second time he referred to it was during a visit to one of the leading Roman seminaries, the Collegio Capranica. There the Pope pointed out that it was not a question of another pious practice but that it was an ardent movement of the spirit and of the heart which seeks to make its own the longing and the supreme aspiration of the divine Master, who a few hours before His immolation on the Cross implored of His Father the unity of all men.

Again in a visit to a rest home for ailing priests, Pope John urged them to pray for a particular intention of his during the Unity Octave. It is also quite significant that the Holy Father chose the date of January 25 to announce the convocation of a general council, one of whose purposes would be the furtherance of Christian unity.

* * *

Interconfessional Unity Meeting in London

As in past years, one of the principal events in England in connection with the Unity Octave was the inter-denominational meeting in London at St. Pancras Town Hall, sponsored by the Church Union, an Anglican society for the promotion of Christian unity. The chairman for this year was the Anglican Bishop of Stepney, the Rt. Rev. F. E. Lunt, while the three speakers representing the Catholic, the Anglican, and the Methodist positions respectively were: the Rt. Rev. Basil Butler, Abbot of Downside Abbey; Canon C. A. Simpson, professor of Hebrew at Oxford; and the Reverend Marcus Ward.

In his address, Canon Simpson called for a re-examination of viewpoints on all sides. « We may understand what the Holy Ghost is saying », he declared, « but we have not paid sufficient attention to what He is saying it about ». Dr. Simpson spoke about the obstinacy and pride which entered into considerations of Christian unity, and was of the opinion that these sins were deeper than was sometimes supposed. Another point the speaker made was that it was important to understand the historical context in which the words of the New Testament were spoken. « The prayer for unity », he concluded, would be more useful and effective if we confessed that we have tended to absolutise our own reading of history, and we must ask for grace to re-examine our assumptions ».

The Abbot of Downside in his discourse said that it could not be denied that Christ had left behind not a mere collection of do-

cuments, but a living society of human beings, prepared to claim that they were the true and new Israel of God and that the message they offered to mankind, and the consequences of that message, had the sanction of the Holy Ghost.

« As we turn to the pages of the New Testament to find out and see if we can find common ground for our consideration of those problems which beset us », said Dom Butler, « it appears to me that the Church is presented in the New Testament as the central datum of God's revealed will and gift to mankind ».

Dr. Lunt, in his turn, affirmed that the unity all desired depended on the providence of God. « Only God », he said, « can give us that unity, because in His infinite mercy He shares it with us. We face the obligation of approaching all our difficulties in the context of the unity we already possess.

« The great Christian truths we hold in common are creative, positive, and constructive. Only God can bring us to unity, and we should regard it as an obligation daily to pray that everything in our hearts and in our Churches that militates against the working of His Spirit may, by His influence be overcome ». (*Ch. Times*).

* * *

World Council Executive Committee Meets in Geneva

The fourteen-member Executive Committee of the World Council of Churches held its semi-annual meeting from February 9-13 at the Geneva headquarters of the Council. The Executive Committee comes together twice a year for its regular summer and winter meetings. Its components are elected by the Central Committee, the more important body which carries out the decisions made by the General Assembly of the World Council when it meets every six years.

The présent members of the Executive Committee are: Dr. Franklin Clark Fry, Lutheran, USA, who is chairman of the group; Dr. Ernest A. Payne, Baptist, United Kingdom; Dr. Eugene Carson Blake, Presbyterian, USA; Dr. Kathleen Bliss, Anglican, United Kingdom; Archbishop Yngve Brilioth, Church of Sweden; the Rev. Peter Dagadu, Methodist, Ghana; Bishop Lakdasa De Mel, Church of India, Pakistan, Burma, and Ceylon; Professor Georges Florovsky, Orthodox, USA; Professor J. L. Hromadka, Czech Brethren, Czechoslovakia; Metropolitan James of Melita, representing the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople; Dr. Martin Niemöller, Evangelical Church in Germany; Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam, Meth-

odist, USA; Mr. Rajaiah D. Paul, Church of South India; Dean Liston Pope, Congregationalist, USA.

Among the various items discussed during the sessions of the committee was the recent decision of Pope John XXIII to convoke a general council, an event which Dr. W. A. Visser 't Hooft calls of « special significance for the World Council ». Other subjects on the agenda included the General Secretary's report; a discussion of the proposed integration of the World Council of Churches and the International Missionary Council; relations with the Moscow Patriarchate of the Russian Orthodox Church; progress reports on two studies, one on religious liberty and one on proselytism; plans for a new headquarters building in Geneva; preparation for the meeting of the Central Committee this summer on the Isle of Rhodes; and reports from the Council's staff. It was also agreed to propose to the WCC's Central Committee that the number of delegates for the Council's third Assembly in 1961, scheduled for Ceylon, be limited to 600. (*EPS*).

* * *

Fordham Conference Discusses Problems Separating Orthodox from Rome.

The twenty-first annual Conference on Eastern Rites and Liturgies recently sponsored by Fordham University in New York was marked this year by a discussion of issues which separate the Orthodox Churches from union with the Holy See. The principal speakers were Fr. Clement C. Englert, professor of Oriental and Patristic Theology at Fordham's Russian Institute, who spoke on the topic: « Can Catholics and Orthodox Unite? » — and Professor Nicholas S. Arseniev of St. Vladimir's Orthodox Theological Seminary of New York who gave the Orthodox point of view. Some three hundred persons were present for the sessions.

Both speakers agreed that the question of papal supremacy would be the central problem facing Catholic and Orthodox leaders at the coming ecumenical council called by Pope John XXIII. Each expressed the hope that agreements could be reached on such problems as the position of Our Lady in both traditions and the question of Purgatory.

Touching on the ancient controversy over the inclusion of the *Filioque* in the Creed, Father Englert said that the ecumenical council might not insist on it being included in the Orthodox credo. Both speakers stressed the positive and negative attitudes which the

Pope said should inspire all those who hope for the success of the coming council. The positive attitude, they said, should be prayer for the success of the council; the negative attitude, an awareness that there have been faults on both sides in the past and nothing would be gained by trying to place the blame for the division. (NC).

* * *

Dr. Christopher Dawson Sees Growing Trend towards Unity among Christians.

Speaking at Ravenhill Academy in Philadelphia, Christopher Dawson, the first professor of Roman Catholic studies at Harvard University Divinity School, said that a movement toward Christian unity is evident in the world. « Men's minds are turning toward Christian unity », he said. « If Catholics do their part we cannot doubt that God will bring back Christian unity ».

The noted historian and philosopher declared that there are three areas in which the Catholics of the United States can be active for the establishment of Christian unity: 1) the ecumenical council announced by Pope John XXIII; 2) the individual apostolate, or Catholic Action, and 3) the overall impact of the Catholic body as a whole upon the Protestant world. He said that Catholics of this country are particularly fortunate in that the rift between them and Protestants is more clearly of a theological nature, not confused by economic, social, and nationalistic issues. In the countries of Europe and the Far East, he said, many external barriers to unity must first be removed before the basic theological differences can be resolved. In the United States, he said, Protestants and Catholic share a common culture.

Dr. Dawson, a convert to the Catholic faith, declared that the movement of Protestant churches toward unity was a promising sign, and that men must begin to cooperate more actively with God in seeking the great advantages of unity. (*The Pilot*).

* * *

Interfaith Discussions Criticized as Centering Too Much On the Sociological.

During a number of addresses he gave before Catholic groups in the Kansas City area, theologian Father John M. Oesterreicher, director of the Institute of Judaeo-Christian Studies at Seton Hall University, Newark, N. J., declared that recent interfaith discussions have centered on sociological issues.

Commenting on recent discussions between members of the three major religious communities, Fr. Oesterreicher said: « Lately, Protestant, Jewish and Catholic churchmen and theologians have gathered together, and what did they discuss? They talked about religion in a free society, or religion in a pluralist society, or the relationship of Church and State. Their discussions seemed to me those of sociologists rather than those of theologians ... We are afraid of tackling the real problems. We avoid the center and remain at the periphery. What America needs is more, not less, theology: an earnest search for God and the things of God, earnest conversation, a conversation that is held in an atmosphere of friendliness, without the least minimizing the differences ».

Father Oesterreicher is a convert from Judaism, and is editor of the Judaeo-Christian Institute yearbook, *The Bridge,* a publication dedicated to establishing a « dialogue » between Christians and Jews. Commenting on the « dialogue » approach, he said: « We need to listen to one another and speak to one another, learn to understand one another. Thus, our disagreements may be shortened but our agreements would be deepened. Our respect for one another would grow. And with the help of God we would move closer to that unity Christians and Jews alike await, move nearer to the day when God will be all in all » (*NC*).

* * *

Graymoor Unity Apostolate ask Prayers For Success of Council

The Chair of Unity Apostolate has called for a national campaign of prayer for the success of the forthcoming ecumenical council announced by His Holiness, Pope John XXIII. Directors of the Apostolate, which has its headquarters at Graymoor, Garrison, New York, have urged expansion of the 50,000-member League for Unity which it sponsors. The objectives of the League, they point out, are « substantially the same as those outlined by Pope John » when he announced his intention of convening the council.

The Very Reverend Fr. Angelus F. Delahunt, S. A., Superior General of the Friars of the Atonement who conduct the Apostolate, commented that it would be most fitting for the League « to expand widely now as special means of prayer for the success of the council and of bringing souls into the unity of the Catholic faith ».

Leaflets containing the League's prayer for unity are available without cost from the Apostolate's headquarters at the Friars' Graymoor monastery. The leaflets are published in English, Spanish, Italian, Russian, and Hungarian. (*NC*).

* * *

Anglicans Study Merger with other New Zealand Churches

The Triennial General Synod of the Anglican Church of New Zealand in a meeting held in December examined the possibility of a merger with other religious bodies in that country. The Synod cleared the way for entrance into « exploratory conversations » with a joint standing committee on union by Methodists, Presbyterians, Congregationalists, and the Associated Churches of Christ. The proposal is similar to that adopted last November by the Anglican Church of the Province of Canada towards union with the United Church of Canada. The General Synod also voted for limited intercommunion with the Church of South India. The latter body was formed in 1947 from former Anglican, Methodist, Presbyterian, and Congregationalist churches. (*EPS*).

* * *

Presiding Bishop of American Episcopal Church Sees Growing Church Unity.

In the view of Rt. Rev. Arthur Carl Lichtenberger, who became Presiding Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States in January, separated Christian bodies will move closer to unity during the next decade; and new understanding between Protestants and Catholics will come about.

At a news conference late in January, Dr. Lichtenberger expressed the doubt that the different Christian churches will ever reach complete agreement on matters of liturgy, doctrine, and Biblical interpretation. However, he pointed out that the recent union of the Congregational Christian and Evangelical and Reformed Churches into the United Church of Christ showed the way to a unitive pattern that other divided groups might well follow.

On the subject of Roman Catholic-Protestant relations, Bishop Lichtenberger declared: « I would include the Roman Catholic Church in my hopes for ultimate unity. There are signs, particularly in Europe, that we are coming into a period of greater understanding between Rome and the Protestant churches. It will take patience and many years of work to bring about unity in the Christian Church, but we are moving steadfastly in that direction ».

In his inaugural sermon the new presiding bishop also touched upon the issue of Christian disunion and said that unity and mission are the two key words for the Church of our day. « Whatever

may be our convictions about the right approach to unity », he declared, « all of us should pray that the Church may be visibly one. This is the unity God has given us, but we have broken that unity and our witness is weakened because we are divided. How hard it is for a divided Church to bear witness of the one Lord to a divided world! » (*EPS*).

AN INVITATION

Visitors to Rome who are not members of the Roman Catholic Church and who wish to obtain information on:

— Christian churches and monuments,
— the meaning of different religious ceremonies,
— doctrines or practices of Catholic life,
— or who desire any other assistance, will receive a special welcome at the:

Foyer UNITAS
Piazza della Rovere, 83
Palazzo Salviati - Tel. 565951

All of the Foyer's services are free of charge.

AROUND THE WORLD

ROME

Pope John XXIII Addresses Letter to People of Rome on Proximate Synod

The *Osservatore Romano* for February 21 carried an announcement of the diocesan Synod for Rome as well as a letter from His Holiness, Pope John, to the Roman people with respect to it. In his letter, the Pope explains that such a Synod is « the meeting of the Bishop with his priests to study the problems of the spiritual life of the faithful, to give or restore vigor to ecclesiastical law in order to root out abuses, to promote Christian living, and to encourage divine worship and the practice of religion ».

Observing that Rome has special problems as a diocese, the Holy Father continued: « Today we are no longer dealing with the old Rome, which still held the outward appearance of a holy city, and where pastoral problems, because of the times and because of the relatively small population, were considerably less than they are today. In our day Rome is a great modern capital with almost two million inhabitants, with all the spiritual and moral problems that urban living brings in its train, together with some very delicate questions that are all her own. This is why we feel that the time has come for Rome, too, to study and apply all the means at our command towards the end known today as ' pastoral modernization ' of everything that we as Bishop of Rome are responsible for to God ».

Pope John will personally address the faithful of Rome while the Synod is in progress, and he has exhorted them to pray for its success, asking them to recite the minor doxology three times after the Angelus every day for the success of the diocesan Synod, the Ecumenical Council which will follow it, and the revision of the Code of Canon Law. (*The Tablet*).

Holy Father Hails Epistle to the Romans as ' Basis of Christian Theology '

In a letter to His Eminence, Giuseppe Cardinal Pizzardo, Prefect of the Sacred Congregation of Seminaries and Universities,

His Holiness, Pope John paid tribute to the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans on the occasion of the observance of the Epistle's nineteenth centenary. The Pope's letter was read before a gathering of the Church's most prominent theologians and Scripture scholars at the Lateran University.

The Pope said in his letter that St. Paul in this Epistle « distinguished himself by the greatness of the divine revelations, by the acuteness of thought, by the heavenly spirit pervading the eminently sound precepts of the moral law, and by his fiery eloquence ». His Holiness went on to say that the Epistle « is in fact the compendium of the entire doctrine of the Apostle and the basis of Christian theology, to be compared with a brilliant lighthouse dispelling the darkness and showing the way to the history of the salvation of mankind ».

The Holy Father added that it was right that the Romans should in particular make a formal commemoration of the writing of the Epistle and expressed the hope that the centenary would inspire theologians to study even more thoroughly the contents of the Apostle's letter; and that the faithful, by drawing inspiration from it, should renew their intentions to live a truly Christian life.

In an editorial in the *Osservatore Romano,* Count Giuseppe Dalla Torre declared that St. Paul's Letter to the Romans is most applicable to present day living, and that its appeal and significance is as great as it was nineteen hundred years ago when it was written. « The reasons and aims given by St. Paul to justify his famous epistle about the year 58 A. D. to the Christian community of Rome », wrote Dalla Torre, « are the same today ... His moral, social, and political conclusions apply to the present — and most particularly, the exhortations and remedies he urgently suggested ».

Speaking of St. Paul's letter as if it were written in our own day, the editor of the *Osservatore Romano* remarked: « The Apostle indicates to us with the same vigor the road of Christian and civil restoration in justice and charity ... He teaches it with thoughts not only of nineteen centuries ago but of today. Through the paraphrases of the Letter to the Romans pronounced in every word by John XXIII, it could be said that the historical epistle has actually been delivered on this twenty-fourth of January ».

Former Anglican Clergyman Ordained in Rome

Following the decision taken in 1955 by the Convocation of Canterbury to establish intercommunion with the Church of South

India, a group of clergymen left the Church of England and became converts to the Catholic faith. The recognition of the ordinations effected in the Church of South India convinced them that the authentic priesthood of Christ could not be found in Anglicanism.

One of the most prominent of these clergymen was Walton Hannah, well known for his vigorous writings against indifferentism and Free Masonry, and who as a member of the Annunciation Group had led an unsuccessful resistance against the decisions of Canterbury which were felt to compromise the Catholic principles of the Anglican Church.

Late in 1955 Fr. Hannah entered the Beda College in Rome to take up studies in preparation for the priesthood. After completing the major part of his theological studies, he was ordained at the Basilica of St. John Lateran on March 14. Fr. Hannah's first assignment following his ordination will take him to Montreal, Canada.

* * *

THE UNITED STATES

American Bishop Notes Interest of Holy See in Work of United Nations

The Catholic Church has not restricted herself to teaching interest in the international community, but has participated actively and practically in hundreds of conferences and works sponsored by the United Nations. This was the principal point made in an address by Bishop James H. Griffiths to the John Carroll Society in Washington. The Society is composed of Catholic laymen who are prominent in the business and professional life of Washington.

Bishop Griffiths, who is Auxiliary Bishop of New York and chairman of the United States Bishops' Committee for the Pope's Peace Plan, quoted the late Pope Pius XII as admitting that the United Nations has its imperfections, but stating at the same time that the Church is interested in international affairs and that the United Nations at the present time offers the only means for an approach to international amity and good will. Since the U. N. came into existence in 1945, Bishop Griffiths noted, the late Pope time and again gave the teaching of the Church on this enterprise. « While he praised the objectives as set forth in the preamble of the Charter », said the Bishop, « Pope Pius more than once alluded

to the fact that it is now and will be in the formative stage of evolution and that consequently it has its imperfections for the elimination of which we must collaborate. »

Bishop Griffiths pointed out that « since the establishment of the United Nations Organization, the Holy See has been in constant contact with it and has participated in scores of its activities — a fact which is known to relatively few persons. While the Holy See is not a member of the United Nations, it is in constant contact with the General Secretariate of the U. N. from which it receives the invitations to attend conferences all over the world. « The Holy See », continued the speaker, « is represented at the sessions of the Economic and Social Council. It is a member of the Executive Committee for the Program of the High Commission for Refugees. It has a permanent observer at the Food and Agricultural Organization and also at UNESCO — the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. — In Paris the first observer of the Holy See at UNESCO was Archbishop Roncalli, who is now Pope John XXIII.

A further point made by Bishop Griffiths was that the Holy See is a full-fledged member of the International Atomic Energy Agency. Both its representatives on this agency are Americans, namely, Fr. Theodore Hesburgh, president of Notre Dame University, and Mr. Frank Folsom of the Radio Corporation of America. (*NC*).

New Greek Orthodox Bishop Elected for the Americas.

The Metropolitan James A. Coucouzes of Melita has recently been elected to succeed the late Archbishop Michael as head of the Greek Orthodox Church of North and South America, which claims some 1.150,000 adherents.

Since 1955 the newly-elected Archbishop has been the representative of the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople, as well as of the Orthodox Patriarchates of Antioch, Alexandria, and Jerusalem, at the headquarters of the World Council of Churches at Geneva.

Archbishop James, who is forty-seven years old, was born on the Island of Imbros, Turkey, and received his training at the theological school at Halki, Constantinople, and at Harvard Divinity School. His duties as priest and teacher called him to America where between 1939 and 1955 he served as professor and dean of the Greek Theological Seminary in Connecticut, dean of the Hellenic Cathedral of New City, dean of the Greek Orthodox Cathedral

of Boston, and dean of the Greek Orthodox Seminary of Brookline, Mass. He is likewise a member of the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches, and over the last number of years has been prominent as an exponent of Orthodox views at ecumenical meetings. Before proceeding to New York for his enthronization, Metropolitan James visited the Foyer Unitas in Rome, where he delivered an irenic address on Orthodox-Catholic relations. This was followed by an interesting question and answer period. (*EPS*).

* * *

GERMANY

East German Bishops Urge Catholics to Shun Compromise

The Roman Catholic Bishops of East Germany have recently issued a letter in which they call upon Catholics to avoid any public declaration which would compromise their position as Church members. The Bishops, whose message was read in all the Catholic churches in the East German Republic, felt compelled to make this admonition in the face of sustained government efforts against Christian practice. They urged the Catholic laity to insist on their freedom of conscience.

The episcopal letters also lamented the fact that the youth of the country have been subjected to an intensive campaign to induce them to take an active part in the Communist youth-dedication ceremony which seeks to supplant the Confirmation rite for Christians.

Taking a decisive stand against the Communist endeavor to substitute non-religious ceremonies for the Church's ritual and sacraments, the Bishop's letter states: « After mature reflection, we declare that no Catholic can participate in a socialist wedding ceremony, the youth dedication, socialist name-giving, socialist funerals, or in any other anti-church ceremonies of the same kind without denying his sacred faith. There is no compromise between faith in God and the religion of godlessness ». (*EPS*)

* * *

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Communist Paper Admits Failure of Atheistic Propaganda To Win Youth

A Communist paper in Czechoslovakia has voiced disappointment over the failure of atheistic propaganda to win over that na-

tion's youth, most of whom, it stated, still « cling stubbornly » to their religious convictions. According to information reaching Vienna, the admission of failure was contained in an article on the third congress of the Czechoslovak Youth Union published by *Mlada Fronta,* official organ of Communist youth organizations. A speaker of the congress blamed the ineffectiveness of the propaganda both on the « bourgeois mentality » and the « political indifference » that still prevail among the nation's youth. (*NC*)

* * *

NORWAY

English Periodical Devotes Special Number to Catholicism in Norway

The February issue of *The Month,* an English review published by the Jesuit Fathers of Farm Street, London, is dedicated to Catholicism in Norway. A series of five articles present the reader with a comprehensive survey of the religious scene of that country, with particular reference to the Catholic Church, both in its past and present phases. Of singular interest is the essay on the Reformation in Norway by Dr. Oskar Garstein, a Lutheran contributor.

The rest of the articles, together with their authors, are: « Norway since the Reformation », by Hallvard Rieber-Mohn, O. P. « Nicholas Breakspeare in Norway » (an account of the work of the English bishop in that country before he became Pope Adrian IV) by David Knowles; « Does Hell Exist » (a doctrinal controversy in the Lutheran Church of Norway) by Finn D. Thorn, O. P.; « Sigrid Undset » by A. H. Winsnes; and « Norwegian Monasticism », by John Gran, of the Cistercian Order.

* * *

HUNGARY

Budapest Catholic Seminary Being « Reorganized » under Government Pressure

According to reports reaching Munich, the Theological Academy and Central Theological Seminary in Budapest have been closed and are being « reorganized ». This action is seen as marking a new step in the efforts of Hungary's Communist rulers to subordinate the Church to the government.

The rector of the seminary, Father Polyondi, has been removed

and replaced by a Dr. Imre Varkonyi; and the new spiritual advisor is Father Pacific Kiraly, described as the first of Hungary's so-called « peace priests » who has collaborated with the Communists since 1949. The acting dean of the academy, D. Szoerensyi, is reported to have announced that the « Hungarian Hierarchy » had dismissed fourteen students from the seminary for not acknowledging the country's « new situation ». (*NC*)

* * *

RUSSIA

Resident American Chaplain once more Permitted to Remain at Moscow.

After a lapse of four years, the presence of a chaplain in Moscow to minister to American Catholics resident there has been authorized by the Soviet Government. The new chaplain is Fr. Louis Dion of Worcester, Mass. who is a member of the Assumptionist Order. He succeeds Fr. George Bissonette, A. A. who was constrained to leave Moscow in 1955 in reprisal for the refusal of the American Government to extend the visa accorded to Archbishop Boris, then in the United States in the capacity of exarch for the Patriarchate of Moscow. An agreement has since been reached, permitting a representative of the Moschow Patriarchate to reside in the United States.

Father Dion took up his new duties in the Russian capital late in January and thus resumes a post which came into being in 1933 when an accord was reached between the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt and the then foreign minister to the United States, Maxim Litvinov. (*La Croix*).

* * *

GREECE

Government Halts Construction of Church for Byzantine Rite Catholics.

Following a request of the Orthodox Archbishop of Athens, Theoclitos, the Greek Government has forbidden the completion of a church for Catholics of the Byzantine Rite which was in the process of being constructed in Athens. Begun two years ago when the Minister of Education and Worship gave the necessary permis-

sion, the church was to have accommodated the Byzantine Catholics of the city who have had to attend services in a small chapel situated in the Bishop's house, an arrangement which has proved quite inadequate.

Unfortunately, when the building of the new church was well under way, Orthodox Archbishop Theoclitos, in a letter to the Greek Prime Minister, demanded that the work on the structure cease on the grounds that « we cannot tolerate that all kinds of Roman Catholics go free and uncontrolled in the capital of Greek Christendom ». Reluctant to go counter to the Archbishop's wishes, the Greek authorities accordingly gave orders to halt construction.

The news of this step has been a deep disappointment to many, coming as it does so soon after the election to the papacy of such a friend and admirer of separated Eastern Christians as Pope John XXIII.

In as issue following the government order, the Athens Catholic weekly *Katholiki* inquires why the legal permission to build a Catholic church should depend upon the prejudices of an Orthodox archbishop when the Greek constitution guarantees freedom of worship. The newspaper also notes justly that the measure is in complete contrast to the freedom accorded Greek Orthodox emigrés to build their own churches in predominantly Catholic countries, without any interference on the part of either government or Catholic authorities. (*ANSA*).

BOOK REVIEWS

C. W. Dugmore, D. D., *The Mass and the English Reformers*, Macmillan & Co. London 1958, x-262 pages, price 30 shills.

Dr. Dugmore's thesis is that the English Reformers, in respect of their Eucharistic doctrine, did no more than continue a current of thought that had always been present in genuine Catholic teaching. Dix, Timms, Richardson and other writers on the subject notwthstanding, their eucharistic opinions were neither Lutheran nor Calvinist, and certainly not Zwinglian. Dr. Dugmore calls them ' Reformed-Catholic '.

The book is divided into two parts. The first (which seems to owe not a little to A. J. Macdonald's *The Evangelical Doctrine of Holy Communion*) deals with pre-Reformation eucharistic theology, to indicate the tradition that is said to have inspired the English Reformers. Tertullian is mentioned, and Cyprian, and St. Augustine is dealt with at length, his doctrine being summed up as realist-symbolism, meaning that he taught no real presence (in the present-day Catholic sense) in the Eucharist, for the presence is only in the reception and use, the bread remaining ever bread, and the wine, wine. Ambrose, his contemporary, was teaching a realistic presence, and it was his doctrine that prevailed in the Western Church. But Augustine's ideas never died. They can be traced in Ratramm (9th century), Berengarius (11th century), Wycliff (14th century) and in men like Lambert and Frith.

But with Lambert and Frith, condemned for heresy (the former by Cranmer) and executed, we enter the second and larger part of the book, devoted to showing that Ridley, Latimer and Cranmer, as ' Reformed-Catholics ', continued the Augustinian tradition, that there was nothing in the First Prayer Book against that tradition nor even in the Second which, rather reluctantly. Crammer also produced, and that in Elizabeth's reign the same tradition set its stamp on the religious formularies, imposed there by the ' Reformed-Catholics ' before the influence of the more Puritan element in the new Church was strong.

In his preface Dr. Dugmore anticipates a criticism that might be levelled against his book, that he has not paid « sufficient attention to the influence of the continental Protestants upon the thought of the Anglican Reformers ». That, he says, was not from ignorance, but because he is tired of seeing the suggestion that the Reformers had no background of learning of their own and depended always on others. The reader, then, is warned that he is not to expect a full exposition of the influences that formed the opinions of the English Reformers. On the other hand, he may not realize that even the earlier background is being delineated only, or mainly, from one angle. Admittedly, the first part of the book is, and is intended to be, only a sketch. It traces a single line, a very thin line, a line that disappears for long intervals from view, yet a line that Dr. Dugmore takes as justification for the word ' Catholic ' in his title ' Reformed-Catholic '. Of the tradition, general both in time and place, beginning with St. Ignatius of Antioch, continuing through (and including) St. Augustine to the great theologians and up to and beyond the Reformation, universal also in both East and West, little more is said than Ambrose began it and that he was a realist. Yet that is the real background to Lambert, to Frith, to Ridley, to Latimer, to Cranmer, who knew full well that they were breaking with the generally accepted teaching of the Church. That is true of their theology on the Eucharist, both as a sacrament and as a sacrifice. As Dr. Dugmore frequently notes, they all, and Cranmer in particular, would not allow of any objective sacrifice in the Mass — « Cranmer failed to retain any idea of presenting or pleading before God in the Eucharist the sacrifice of Christ once offered upon the Cross as a ground of our acceptance with Him » (p. 194). « We have already noted the theological blind spot which prevented all the Reformers from achieving a truly catholic conception of the eucharistic sacrifice » (p. 220). So why they should be called « Reformed-Catholics » is somewhat of a puzzle. Luther, Calvin and the rest claimed also to be reproducing the primitive faith more exactly than the contemporary Church. All Reformers did. So why not call them all ' Reformed-Catholics ', especially Luther, since he did not retain a doctrine of a real presence? At the most it might be claimed that Cranmer and his associates singled out and chose to retain part of Augustinian thought, divorced from the rest of it and from the general teaching of the Church. The choosing of a part to the detriment of the whole is the hallmark of heresy.

So it does not seem to me, even if one were to allow that Cranmer and his friends aimed at nothing but a close following of St. Augustine, that the title ' Reformed-Catholics ' is substantiated.

Nevertheless, the attempt to justify it has been worth while, for it has brought out the degree to which the Reformers appealed to St. Augustine, to support not only their ' justification by faith ' (the Mass for them was a ' work '), but also their eucharistic thought. With this as the explanation of their views, Dr. Dugmore has no need to enlarge on the pre-Reformation eucharistic abuses, generally vastly exaggerated. He does, however, make some references to them, giving credence to some of Kidd's less happy accusations and apparently thinking that any of the faithful who do not understand the philosophical basis of transubstantiation must necessarily be ' in danger of falling into idolatry '. Even the simple can *believe* that what was bread is no longer bread without *knowing* the definition of substance.

J. Gill, S. J.

C. Hoare, *The Edwardine Ordinal,* Bristol 1958, ix + 156 pages. Price 17s 6d. (To be obtained from the author at St. Augustine's Nursing Home, 25 Upper Maze Hill, St. Leonard's-on-Sea, Sussex, England).

Fr. Hoare's book is divided into two fairly equal parts. The first reviews very briefly the ecclesiastical history of Edward VI's reign, and then at greater length describes the papal documents of Mary's reign with their clear condemnation of the Edwardine Ordinals as ' not the form of the Church ', and of the action based on them. (The author has previously written a pamphlet on this subject, reviewed in this periodical X (1958) pp. 71-72). The rest of Part I (in two chapters) recounts in detail the history of Parker's ordination according to the second Edwardine Ordinal, not yet legalized by Parliament, as Elizabeth's first archbishop of Canterbury, and adds a selection of judgements on the Ordinal, which from that day to the Anglican Convocation of July 1955 have been expressed either in word or by action.

Part II is all on one theme — the Preface to the Ordinal. Fr. Hoare notes in it seven ambiguities, which he develops at length, partly by argument but mainly by quotations drawn in large measure from Anglican sources.

Fr. Hoare has obviously devoted much time and study to his brochure. A large part of its material, as his first references show, is drawn from a few books, but books not easy to come by, since some if not all of them are now out of print. But if he found

much of his material there, he has used it in his own way, to illustrate in particular the Ordinal.

Personally I should have liked more, indeed much more, quotation in parallel columns from the Sarum rite and the Anglican rite. Such comparisons do exist in print, I know, but they also are difficult to obtain. Yet such a comparison is as telling an argument against the sufficiency of the Anglican Ordinal as any, because it drives home the extent and the nature of the alterations introduced by Cranmer and his associates.

J. Gill, S. J.

Fragen der theologie heute, Herausgegeben von Johannes Feiner, Josef Trütsch und Franz Böckle, Professoren des Priesterseminars St. Luzi in Chur, Benziger Verlag, Einsiedeln, Zürich, Köln, 1957, 586 pp.

This book is composed of 21 papers by the most prominent Swiss and German theologians, among them, for instance, Karl Rahner and Hans Urs von Balthasar, forming a panorama of the latest developments in Fundamental Theology, Dogmtic Theology, and in Practical Theology. The contributions quite naturally concentrate their attention on the theology of the German-speaking world, without, however, ignoring the more significant French authors.

The book happily avoids the danger of limiting itself to a presentation of factual data (an impressive amount of which it does contain) through the personal, and therefore readable, way in which the authors approach their subjects, and by focusing on the reality of the problems, rather than on their more historic aspects. The titles of the individual papers give an impression of the wide range and the importance of the subjects: Mythology and Revelation, Faith and Knowledge, The nature of the Tradition, The Inspiration and Infallibility of the Holy Scriptures, *The Apostolic Succession and the Primacy,* Nature and Grace, The Origins of Mankind, The Image of Christ in Modern Catholic Theology, Problems and Prospects of Modern Mariology, *On the conceptual Unity of the Church, The Church and the Churches.* The Sacraments as Instruments for the Encounter with God, Eschatology, Aspirations of Moral Theology, Theology and Social Science, Preaching today, The Doctrinal Basis of the Liturgical Renewal, The Layman in the Church, The Theology of the Realities of the World.

The articles, whose titles we have underlined, are evidently of particular interest to the readers of *Unitas*.

Otto Karrer, of Lucerne, writes about the discussion concerning the Apostolic Succession and the Primacy that have developed after Oscar Cullmann's book on Peter in 1953. The bibliography on the argument is already formidable, both on the Catholic and the Protestant side. Apart from the scriptural and historical arguments involved, it would seem that the greatest Catholic contribution to a better understanding of the Papacy on the part of our Protestant brethren may be expected through more complete explanations of the relation between the authority of Christ and the authority of the Pope, in other words, of the extent and nature of the Pope's authority; and secondly, in a clearer distinction between the essential elements of the Papacy and its contingent historical features.

Otto Semmelroth, S. J., of St. Georgen, Frankfurt, writes on the developments in the understanding of the concept of the Church. From the juridical approach of the Counter-Reformation, in which emphasis was given to the explicit profession allegiance to the Pope, modern Ecclesiology now tries to penetrate the more substantial aspects of the Church, — the Church as the People of God, as sacramental, as the Bride of Christ, and as the Body of Christ. The author develops, in particular, the idea of the Church as an « Ursakrament », a « sacramentum radicale », — not in addition to the seven traditional Sacraments, but as their basis, — and like to them: a visible, efficacious sign of grace, claiming a disposition on the part of the person to be sanctified. The main difference between the Church and the seven Sacraments is the permanence of the former and the momentaneous character of the latter, — but this is a note not appertaining to the sacramental notion.

Thomas Sartory, Editor of the *Una-Sancta-Rundbriefe*, treats, in forty pages, of The Church and the Churches, the « existential » consequences of the reorientation discussed in the preceding paper. He examines, first of all, the use made by Protestant theologians of the terms, such as: « The Body of Christ », that are present in the focus of Catholic interest, demostrating that these terms are employed by the Protestants with a completely different meaning. He does not, however, content himself with this affirmation, but proceeds to a most fruitful exposition of the various presuppositions of the Protestant Ecclesiology, at the basis of which is seen a different concept of the humanity of Christ, of His mission (the question of Christ as the second Moses), of the nature of Grace, — in particular of the concept of « gratia creata » and of the role of se-

cond causes, — differences pointing further back to a different approach to the Revelation as such and to different philosophies and presuppositions.

As for Catholic theology, Fr. Sartory underlines the usefulness of a differentiation between various concepts of the membership in the Church. This is a method that may be traced back to St. Augustine and St. Thomas, and it is to some extent expressed in Canon Law. It is virtually contained in the doctrine of the « baptismum flaminis » and of the other instances where a « voto » is recognized as to some extent substituting a missing reality. Fr. Sartory also touches the very delicate question of the nature of the « vestigia ecclesiae » that are present in societies outside the hirarchical body of the Catholic Church.

In the other chapters of this most stimulating book there are likewise to be found interesting confrontations of Catholic and Protestant concepts, with reference to Barth, Bultmann, and Cullmann as the most numerous.

EDVARD VOGT

MAURICE VILLAIN. *Introduction à l'Oecumenisme.* Casterman: Tournai-Paris, 1958, pp. 260.

In this new work, Fr. Maurice Villain, a disciple and the biographer of the late Abbé Couturier, exposes his way of looking at ecumenism. He treats first of all the Ecumenical Movement, its origins, and its History, as well as of the organization and activity of its principal creation which is the World Council of Churches. In the second part of his work he explores the nature of the great divisions of Christendom: Protestantism, Anglicanism, Orthodoxy, Catholicism (the latter as viewed very objectively by two Protestant theologians). Under the title of « Spiritual Ecumenism », he explains what could be termed his ecumenical doctrine which is inspired by that of the Abbé Couturier and which carries it further. He concludes with practical counsels relating to ecumenical formation and to ecumenical activity.

The author is quite sympathetic; his charity and enthusiasm are abundantly in evidence. One reads his book with sustained interest. Our separated brethren will be pleased with pages where no word will be found to hurt their feelings and where the Christian values which they have preserved are fully acknowledged. Catholics will find in this work an ardent appeal for the quest of Christian unity and will be made more conscious of the importance of con-

temporary ecumenism. The author, who is completely dedicated to the cause of unity, abounds with information and worthwhile counsels, so that his book will be usefully consulted.

Father Villain, nevertheless, knows that I am not in agreement with him on several points. I must admit that I do not understand how a Catholic who associates himself with the priestly prayer of Christ for unity could forget that the unity willed by Christ is that of the Roman Catholic Church. M. Oscar Cullmann, the noted Protestant theologian, cannot understand this either since he writes: « If Catholics pray, as believing Catholics, for the unity of the Church, they must necessarily pray for our submission to Rome ». (*Catholiques et Protestants,* Delachaux & Niestlé, 1958).

I also think that we must not give a pejorative sense to the laudable word « apologetics » and that one cannot exclude apologetics itself from the field of ecumenism. In his book Father Villain defends Protestants and Orthodox from certain interpretations of Catholics. Why, then, should we not be allowed to defend holy Mother Church when there is occasion to do so? And there is often occasion for it when we converse with non-Catholics. The truth should be on an equal level for all.

With this said — and these observations I felt bound to make — I wish to thank Father Villain for the enlightenment and apostolic enthusiasm which I have found in this introduction, and from which I hope to have profited.

Charles Boyer, S. J.

THE UNITAS ASSOCIATION

is an international organization whose purpose it is to promote the spiritual union of men and especially of Christians. It was founded in Rome in 1945 *by a group of professors and writers, priests and laymen; and in June of that year received the blessing of Pope Pius XII. Fr. Charles Boyer, S. J., Dean of the Theological Faculty of the Gregorian University in Rome, was elected president of the Association and also serves as editor of its organ* Unitas *which appears in three editions: English, French, and Italian.*

Established at the center of Catholicity, the Unitas Association in carrying on its activities endeavours to follow with studied perfection the guidance of the Holy See. In striving to fulfill its purpose, it attempts to regulate its mission in accordance with the following principles:

To Catholics it recalls the benefits of the unity which they enjoy and the duty which is incumbent upon them to pray for those who are deprived of it. The Association invites the active co-operation of non-Catholics and exhorts them to keep ever before them the advice of Pope Pius XI: « This unity ought to be promoted less by discussion or other means than by the example of a saintly life ».

To its separated brethren of the Eastern Churches, it speaks of those long glorious centuries of union when the Doctors of the East illumined the universal Church and triumphed with their Latin brethren over the most subtle and distressing heresies. Unitas lays stress upon all that the separated East has preserved in common with Catholics: the priesthood, the Sacraments, the cult of the Blessed Virgin Mary. It makes clear the duty of union and strives to eliminate the barriers which prejudice and resentment have in the course of the centuries erected between Christians of the East and West.

To Anglicans and Protestants, Unitas reveals the genuine character of the Roman Catholic Church. Across the imperfections of men, it tries to make evident that spirit of fraternal affection and faithfulness to the teachings of Christ which is at the very heart of the Church's life and the manifestation of the Holy Spirit at work in her. Finally, Unitas keeps in close touch with the Ecumenical Movement, and endeavours to aid it in its quest for unity.

* * *

The Unitas Association has affiliated groups in Italy, France, Belgium, Canada, and Turkey. All that is necessary to form a group of this kind to further the aim of Christian unity is that a small number of persons of good will plan their organization, obtain the approval of their bishop, and then make their step known to the Central Committee of the Association in Rome.